TROLLOPE'S *THACKERAY:* ONE PHASE OF VICTORIAN BIOGRAPHY

By
MARK DOUGLAS HAWTHORNE

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
August, 1964

DEDICATION

I would like to dedic this dissertation to my wife whose patience has been the grea single factor in its composition.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation for the interest and patience of Dr. William Ruff, who directed this dissertation. Without his continual encouragement and his help in procuring otherwise inaccessible material, this dissertation would not have been completed. I also wish to express my appreciation for the help that I have received from Dr. August Staub and Dr. Alton C. Morris, who were members of the Supervisory Committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	ABBREVIATIONS	v
	INTRODUCTION	1
I	THE FORMATION OF TROLLOPE'S PREJUDICE	8
II	THACKERAY'S CORNHILL MAGAZINE AND TROLLOPE'S CONTRIBUTION	48
III	1860—THE YEAR OF MISUNDERSTANDINGS	84
IV	TROLLOPE'S OPINION OF THACKERAY FROM 1861 UNTIL 1876	109
V	TROLLOPE'S THACKERAY: THE MANIPULATION OF FACT	150
	EPILOGUE	217
	APPENDIX A: A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF THACKERAY AND TROLLOPE, 1857-1863	228
	APPENDIX B: THE TEXT OF YATES'S TOWN TALK ARTICLE	234
	APPENDIX C: A PARAGRAPH ANALYSIS OF THACKERAY SHOWING TROLLOPE'S CONTENT AND SOURCES	236
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	242

ABBREVIATIONS

Adversity. Gordon N. Ray, Thackeray: The Uses of Adversity, 1811-1846 (New York, 1955).

Autobiography. Anthony Trollope, An Autobiography (Garden City, New York, n.d.).

George Eliot Letters. Gordon S. Haight (ed.), The George Eliot Letters (New Haven, 1954-1955).

Recollections and Experiences. Edmund Yates, Edmund Yates: His Recollections and Experiences (London, 1884).

Thackeray. Anthony Trollope, Thackeray ("English Men of Letters"; London, 1879).

Thackeray Letters. Gordon N. Ray (ed.), The Letters and Private Papers of William Makepeace Thackeray (Cambridge, 1945-1946).

Trollope Letters. Bradford A. Booth, The Letters of Anthony Trollope (London, 1958).

Wisdom. Gordon N. Ray, Thackeray: The Age of Wisdom, 1847-1863 (New York, 1958).

Works. Anne Thackeray Ritchie (ed.), The Biographical Edition of the Works of William Makepeace Thackeray (London, 1898-1899).

INTRODUCTION

A biography written by a novelist about a contemporary novelist presents a unique phenomenon, but when that biography appears against the wishes of its subject, the result is a work that raises questions about its origin in the lives of the men concerned and its importance in literary history. On the evening of November 20, 1862, Henry Silver wrote in his diary that Thackeray, disliking Mary Gordon's life of John Wilson, said, "JW did nothing worth record--and the effect of the life upon him, Thy, was to make him tell his daughters 'Mind, no biography' of himself."[1] Even though Mr. Gordon N. Ray attributes Thackeray's strictures to an anxiety caused by the fear of scandalous rumors that his enemies might circulate after his death,[2] Thackeray's reticence was a typical reaction of a Mid-Victorian writer. As early as March 24, 1840, Tennyson condemned biographical writing in The Examiner:

> For now the Poet cannot die,
> Nor leave his music as of old,
> But round him ere he scarce be cold
> Begins the scandal and the cry:
>
> "Proclaim the faults he would not show;
> Break lock and seal, betray the trust;
> Keep nothing sacred, 'tis but just
> The many-headed beast should know."
>
> ("To _____. After Reading a Life and Letters," 13-20)

After the first edition of Pauline (1833) and John Stuart Mill's criticism, Browning sought obscurity behind the many characters of his dramatic monologues, and in 1876, he attacked the biographical approach to his work in such poems as "House" and "Shop." Thomas Huxley wrote his Autobiography in order to prevent the inaccuracies that a biographer would inevitably make. This strange reluctance of a public figure, or of the family of a public figure, to have biographical materials presented to the public prevented an authorized version of William Makepeace Thackeray's life until Mr. Ray's admirable work, Thackeray: The Uses of Adversity (1955) and Thackeray: The Age of Wisdom (1958). But sixteen years after Thackeray's death, and after several unauthorized lives, Anthony Trollope was commissioned to write a volume on Thackeray for Morley's English Men of Letters series. This little volume, Thackeray (1879), was apparently the first biography for which the Thackeray family, and especially his daughter Lady Ritchie, offered any help and is, therefore, important in the development of Thackeray biography.

While Mr. Ray is quite justified in brushing Trollope's little volume aside by remarking "his book is . . . of little biographical importance,"[3] the volume is indispensable in reaching an understanding of Trollope's relation to his more prominent contemporary. Documents remain that reveal Lady Ritchie's aid and approval, however slight. But, apart from the accuracy of Trollope's account, the Thackeray volume presents a departure from those trends of biographical writing that tie the major nineteenth century biographies, such as

Lockhart's Life of Sir Walter Scott (1836-1838), Stanley's Life of Thomas Arnold (1844), or Froude's Life of Thomas Carlyle (1882-1884), to the high point of eighteenth century biography, Boswell's Life of Johnson (1791). In Thackeray, Trollope presents his subject as honestly as he can, as Boswell and Lockhart had honestly presented their subjects, but unlike these predecessors Trollope's honesty resulted in a picture of Thackeray that caused the very people who had aided him to denounce the work. This honesty and its consequent denunciation puts Thackeray in a unique position: the book which was intended to praise its subject attacks Thackeray's personality.

With Thackeray's express desire not to be the subject of a biography and with his family's attempt to preserve his wish,[4] it was no wonder that Trollope's book was rejected and the family disclaimed any reference to the materials used in it. Yet Trollope's approach had already been manifested in the ambivalent view taken toward Sir Rowland Hill, the founder of the penny post and secretary of the Post Office. In An Autobiography, written between October, 1875, and April 30, 1876 (though published posthumously in 1883), Trollope delineated his dislike for his superior:

> How I loved, when I was contradicted,—as I was very often and no doubt very properly,—to do instantly as I was bid, and then to prove that what I was doing was fatuous, dishonest, expensive, and impracticable! And then there were feuds,—such delicious feuds! I was always an anti-Hillite, acknowledging, indeed, the great thing which Sir Rowland Hill had done for the country, but believing him to be entirely unfit to manage men or to arrange labour. It was a pleasure to me to differ from him on all occasions;—and looking back now, I think that in all such differences I was right.[5]

Despite this unflattering account, Trollope had written a letter on March 2, 1864, to Sir Rowland. Here his view was quite different:

> As there is no longer any official connexion between us, I may perhaps say a few words which I could not have said while you were our secretary. . . . I cannot let your resignation from office pass without assuring you of my thorough admiration for the great work of your life. I have admired you for many years as one of the essential benefactors, not only of your own country, but of all the civilized world. I think that the thing you have done has had in it more of general utility than any other measure which has been achieved in my time.[6]

Mr. Pearson Hill, Sir Rowland's son, might have seen "in this praise either a refutation of the 'anti-Hillite' statement or a piece of insincere and fulsome flattery,"[7] and the Postal, Telegraphic, and Telephonic Gazette might have published the letter on November 30, 1883, to belittle Trollope's Autobiography which appeared during the previous month. But, as Professor Bradford A. Booth has pointed out,[8] the two views are compatible: Trollope admired Sir Rowland's public services, but he heartily disliked the Secretary's private character. Trollope's view of Thackeray incorporates this same ambivalence. Through George Smith[9] and through a careless reading of the Autobiography and Thackeray, a legend of a friendship between Trollope and Thackeray has permeated accounts of both men. However, by scrutinizing the documents that have been published and by attempting to reach a clear and unbiased conception of the relation between these figures, we can further understand the Thackeray and assess its value, not as a literary monument, but as an important factor in the historical development of English biographical writing. The conclusion to which we shall be led will

reveal Trollope's unqualified praise of Thackeray's literary achievements and his dislike for or personal antagonism to Thackeray the man. In general, the same basic view that Trollope held concerning Sir Rowland is true of his relation with Thackeray.

In order to see the biography in its full significance, we shall approach it chronologically, beginning our study several years before the two men met. At this point, two or three years before Trollope and Thackeray met, Trollope's opinion of his more famous rival was already being prejudiced. Trollope's work in the Post Office brought him into a relationship with Edmund Yates, the young journalist who was destined to become Thackeray's most hated and most active antagonist. Meanwhile, Yates was before 1858 on rather intimate terms with Thackeray since they belonged to the same clubs. Since Trollope did not know Thackeray until January, 1860, the opinion he received of Thackeray derived from Yates; therefore, since Yates and Thackeray clashed in the Garrick Club Affair of 1858, Trollope's opinion became at that time prejudiced against Thackeray's personality while he continued to admire Thackeray's literary works. This divided opinion might well have been united when the two men were brought together by the founding of the Cornhill Magazine, but Trollope's adverse opinion was strengthened when Thackeray, who was subject to suddenly painful attacks of ill health, snubbed him. Having been snubbed and seeking revenge, Trollope gave Yates in April, 1860, material that enabled the journalist to attack Thackeray once again; after this, the relation between Thackeray and Trollope remained on a strained basis until

December, 1863, when Thackeray died. With the removal of Thackeray's personality, Trollope's devotion to Thackeray's artistic achievement appeared to be a hero-worship to Thackeray's daughter Lady Ritchie. Thus when John Morley wished to include a volume on Thackeray in the English Men of Letters series, Lady Ritchie agreed and answered to the best of her ability the questions sent by Trollope. Trollope used these answers, but he filled in the spaces between them with his own opinion. The result was a biography that placed the subject's works at the top of the literary ladder but that projected a portrait of a weak, indolent, inept, and melancholy personality. Since this was obviously not what Lady Ritchie anticipated, she broke her relations with Trollope and denied having helped him in any manner. It was not until 1891 that she softened in her attitude, probably because the 1880's saw the publication of several attacks that were more violent than Trollope's had been. The little biography is important, therefore, because in it we can see the attack of a major Victorian figure by another Victorian, foreshadowing the approach to Victorian biography introduced by Lytton Strachey in his book Eminent Victorians (1918). But more than merely foreshadowing Strachey, Trollope's volume breaks with the Boswellian-Forster tradition by presenting a picture that attempts to establish a certain truth, even though we shall see that Trollope's "truth" in this matter was not based on verifiable data. Finally the book is important, for it foreshadows the split between biography and criticism that underlies much twentieth century scholarship, especially in the school of the New Critics. Therefore,

Thackeray has a rather clearly defined place in English literary history and deserves our attention because it is a pivotal point in the development of biographical writing.

Notes

[1]Gordon N. Ray, Thackeray: The Uses of Adversity, 1811-1846 (New York, 1955), p. 1. Hereafter referred to as Adversity.

[2]Ibid., p. 2.

[3]Ibid., p. 3.

[4]See, for example, Anne Thackeray Ritchie, "Thackeray and his Biographers," Illustrated London News, XCVIII (June 20, 1891), 811; or Adversity, pp. 1-9.

[5]Anthony Trollope, An Autobiography (Garden City, New York, n.d.), p. 215. Also see p. 109: "With [Sir Rowland Hill] I never had any sympathy, nor he with me. In figures and facts he was most accurate, but I never came across any one who so little understood the ways of men. . . ." Hereafter referred to as Autobiography. All quotations will be presented without alteration of wording, spelling, or punctuation.

[6]Bradford A. Booth, The Letters of Anthony Trollope (London, 1951), p. 148. Hereafter referred to as Trollope Letters.

[7]Edmund H. Yates, Edmund Yates: His Recollections and Experiences (London, 1884), II, 223. Hereafter referred to as Recollections and Experiences.

[8]Trollope Letters, pp. 148-149, fn.2. Also see Recollections and Experiences, II, 223.

[9][Leonard Huxley], The House of Smith, Elder (London, 1923), p. 104.

CHAPTER I

THE FORMATION OF TROLLOPE'S PREJUDICE

The man who was to prejudice Trollope against Thackeray was Edmund Yates. Trollope and Yates, who was sixteen years younger, not only knew one another but were closely enough associated by 1858 that the younger asked the older for friendly, indeed brotherly, help. The common bond that the Post Office gave the men and the common sympathy for Sir Rowland Hill's plans of postal reform brought the two men together and after 1853 provided the grounds upon which an acquaintance could be founded. This acquaintance had developed, despite the infrequent association of the men, into a more personal bond before Trollope's trip to Egypt in 1858. It will be important for us to ascertain this relation in order to understand the formation of Trollope's viewpoint of Thackeray and the circumstances of their first meeting. At this time Trollope did not know Thackeray other than as a literary figure, but, as we shall see, Yates did. Since Trollope's first knowledge of Thackeray's personality was dependent upon Yates's opinion, we need to establish the relations between Trollope and Yates and Yates and Thackeray before we can understand the one that came to exist between Trollope and Thackeray. Given to writing scandalous personal gossip columns, a journalistic feature that he claimed to have originated,[1] Yates was not one of those writers who helped to lift journalism from its low status of the first part of the century.[2]

Yet he was important in the development of Trollope's viewpoint before the 1860's, because during this time he knew Thackeray while Trollope did not. Although the comments made by each concerning the other are almost consistently pejorative, the active dislike that came to exist between them did not originate until the early months of 1860 when Yates betrayed a trust Trollope placed upon him and consequently shoved him into an embarrassing situation. The relation of the two men prior to that situation must be pieced together from the hints that seep through their later antagonism and from their work in the Post Office if Trollope's view of Thackeray is to be understood.

In 1834, Trollope was introduced into the Secretary's Office of the General Post Office at St. Martin's le Grand by his friend Clayton Freeling, the brother of the Secretary, Sir Francis Freeling.[3] Trollope tells us in An Autobiography that during the first seven years, "I was always on the eve of being dismissed, and yet was always striving to show how good a public servant I could become, if only a chance were given me."[4] Sir Francis, a man who outlived his usefulness because he could not adapt to the necessary reforms of the postal system demanded by the public, died in June, 1836,[5] depriving the twenty year old Trollope of his strongest ally in "The Grand," as the headquarters of the Post Office were called. Until August, 1841, when he was transferred to Ireland, Trollope worked under Colonel Maberly, who immediately formed such a low opinion of him that Trollope's days were made miserable:

> Years have gone by, and I can write now, and almost feel, without anger; but I can remember well the keenness of my anguish when I was treated as though I were unfit for any useful work.[6]

After seven years he could stand the situation no longer and boldly volunteered for a post in Banagher in the far west of Ireland, a position that was thought fit only for "a man absurdly incapable"; when he reported to the Secretary of the Irish Post Office on the morning of September 16, 1841, he found that "Colonel Maberly had sent a very bad character."[7] His own hard work and evidently his brother-in-law's efforts in London kept him from being lost in the obscurity of an Irish post, and he mounted steadily "from deputy surveyor to surveyor, from surveyor to special commissioner charged with the planning of a rural postal service."[8]

Meanwhile, an ambitious postal reformer by the name of Rowland Hill had published a surprising pamphlet, Post Office Reform: Its Importance and Practicability in 1837;[9] this pamphlet advocated the basic charge of a penny "on all letters received in a post-town and delivered in the same or any other post-town of the British Isles."[10] The public agitation resulting from Hill's suggestion led to the penny postage and to the birth of the adhesive stamp on May 6, 1840.[11] Having proven the efficiency of these reforms to the public, Hill tried to have Colonel Maberly removed to provide for his appointment as Secretary of the Post Office, but in December, 1846, he took the newly created post of Secretary to the Postmaster-General. Until 1854, when Maberly "had been . . . squeezed into, and his place was filled by Mr.

Rowland Hill,"[12] the Post Office was controlled by a dual secretaryship "with Hill making constant efforts to displace Col. Maberly"[13] and Maberly waiting "for time to prove that Hill was a false prophet."[14]

When Trollope was sent, early in 1851, to western England to "create a postal network which should catch all [rural] recipients of letters,"[15] he was probably acting under orders from Rowland Hill, who had advocated an extension of rural delivery as early as 1843.[16] The enthusiasm that he showed for his work might well have been the reason for his steady promotion under Hill's command:

> It is amusing to watch how a passion will grow upon a man. During those two years it was the ambition of my life to cover the country with rural letter-carriers. I do not remember that in any case a rural post proposed by me was negatived by the authorities. . . .[17]

Although Trollope may not have been popular at "The Grand,"[18] headquarters valued him for his effectiveness and energy.[19] Despite Trollope's dislike for Rowland Hill,[20] the two men wanted the same results--an efficient and inexpensive postal system.

The antagonism between Hill and Trollope might easily have originated, with personal incompatibility, from the issue of pillar boxes in the mid-1850's. In his autobiography Trollope claims the credit for pillar letter-boxes, "of which accommodation in the streets and ways of England I was the originator, having, however, got the authority for the erection of the first at St. Heliers in Jersey."[21] Trollope, who had been sent to the Channel Islands to analyze the local needs, recommended road-side letter-boxes in a letter of November, 1851, to G. H. Cresswell, the Surveyor of the District:

> Iron posts suited for this purpose may be erected at the corners of the streets . . . or perhaps it may be found more desirable to fix iron letter-boxes about five feet from the ground wherever there are permanently built walls.

When Cresswell proposed that these be erected, Colonel Maberly granted permission; the pillar boxes were in use by the end of November, 1852.[22] But Rowland Hill also claimed to have originated the pillar box in 1840; however, it was not until January, 1851, that he reported that they might be tried in London and not until October 11, 1854, that an official announcement of their use was published. The first in London appeared finally in March, 1855.[23] Although Hill, who was in the superior position, took the public credit for this innovation, the correspondence on pillar boxes in the General Post Office refers to the plan as "Mr. Trollope's suggestion."[24] To the inferior this "stealing" of credit due to him was infuriating enough for him to recall some twenty years later; therefore, Trollope had good reason personally to dislike Rowland Hill on grounds other than a personality clash.

In spite of personal animosity the reliability that Trollope displayed in propagating Hill's suggestions during the dual secretaryship led to his being chosen for the special mission to the Pasha of Egypt in 1858. Hill, now Sir Rowland, having successfully pushed the Colonel from the Secretaryship, had taken control of the Post Office in 1854;[25] therefore, Trollope's trip to Egypt must have come as a direct order from Sir Rowland, the man under whom Trollope's career as a civil

servant reached its peak. The importance of the mission, to secure a new treaty with the Pasha for the transportation of the mails through Egypt, made it one that would not have been entrusted to a man whose ability or character was doubted by his superior. Trollope's dedication to the betterment of the Post Office won him the confidence of Sir Rowland, even if it did not enhance the personal feelings on either side.[26] The same confidence is shown in Trollope's missions to revise the Glasgow Post Office, to "cleanse the Augean stables" of the postal system in the West Indies, and to make postal treaties with the governments of Cuba and New Grenada.[27]

Yates's career as a civil servant up to 1860 is quite bleak when compared to Trollope's. Entering the Post Office service at St. Martin's le Grand on March 11, 1847,[28] he began under the dual secretaryship. His first encounter with Rowland Hill, who later became his friend,[29] was the result of his "peppering, with peas and pellets of saturated blotting-paper, of the passers-by" from the windows of his office.[30] He characterized his public service in 1890 on the fiftieth anniversary of penny postage:

> His memories went back to the days of Col. Maberly, his "first chief," who used to impress upon him the necessity of not overworking himself. Mr. Yates assured the group that he had given the Colonel the pledge that he would not, and he had solemnly adhered to that sacred obligation.[31]

Yates's public service, however, was not the trait that brought him into contact with Trollope; rather the positions that he held in relation to Colonel Maberly and Rowland Hill caused him to associate with his more industrious fellow-worker.

Two years after he began working,[32] Yates was transferred to the Colonel's outer office. In this capacity he was brought into close contact with Lord Clanricarde[33] and criticised for having beer on the premises by Lord Hardwicke.[34] He was, therefore, in Colonel Maberly's outer office during the time in which Trollope was working under orders from Rowland Hill. It would be unlikely that any personal contact was made during this time, although Yates might have known Trollope's work through office gossip. The acquaintance of the two men would have to be dated after 1853, the year Lord Hardwicke lost his position as Postmaster-General, unless Trollope's mission to western England in 1851 brought him under Colonel Maberly. Yates's first job at "The Grand" was in the Money Order Department of the Secretary's Office so that from 1847 to 1849, he was under Hill's command:

> Mr. Hill with two or three clerks, prepared statistical returns, suggested economics, and also had the supervision of that secretarial money-order department in which I worked.[35]

If Trollope worked directly under the orders of Hill, whose program of reform was identical with his own work during these years, Yates very well could have heard of him as early as 1847. When he was transferred to Colonel Maberly's outer office, this knowledge possibly led to a closer acquaintance. Hill acted during this time to forward his reforms so that the otherwise awkward "arrangement of two secretaries worked only because there was a separation of duties."[36] Since the situation was extremely delicate, Trollope, working under Hill's supervision, also worked to some extent through the Colonel's office.[37]

On the other hand, Yates, who began in Hill's Money Order Department, was much more in sympathy with the Secretary to the Postmaster-General than with the Secretary of the Post Office.[38] With both men working, at least in part, under the Colonel but favoring the reforms of Rowland Hill, a common bond existed between them; therefore, when the two men were brought into closer affinity between 1853 and 1854 by Yates's return to Hill's direct supervision, there was ample opportunity for a personal acquaintance to begin.

When Rowland Hill rose to Colonel Maberly's position in 1854, he made John Tilley, a man whom the Colonel had already chosen for a chief executive position, the first Assistant Secretary.[39] John Tilley, one of Trollope's "oldest and dearest friends," had married Cecilia Trollope, the novelist's sister, prior to Trollope's transfer to Ireland;[40] therefore, Trollope had a family connection with the top hierarchy of the General Post Office.[41] From this tie to the Secretary's office, Trollope came into closer affiliation with Sir Rowland and the Secretary's personal friend and official ally Edmund Yates. Having proven himself compatible with Sir Rowland's reformation, Trollope was in such a position that his brother-in-law could place his name before the Secretary for any important mission. Yates, an inferior, was in a position to become associated with him; his work directly under Sir Rowland's orders brought him into association with both Hill and Trollope,

> . . . with both of whom I was more or less associated; and, as a bystander is said in the old proverb to see most of the game, it is probable that I, who interfered with neither, had better opportunities for observing their various peculiarities than if I had occupied a less subordinate position.[42]

Between 1853 and 1858, the period that most interests us, Trollope was seldom in London except for short trips; thus the acquaintance of the two men was their meeting in Sir Rowland's office. After December, 1859, Trollope had more occasion to meet Yates, as we shall see later, but the definite ties which can be established in the spring of 1858 and the early months of 1860 had their origin in the years before 1858 when both men, though in different ranks of the Post Office, met in Sir Rowland's office where Yates's position with his superior gave him a firm standing.

To assume that a personal animosity existed between Yates and Trollope at this time is to read the events of 1860 into the period prior to 1858, a historical mistake. Trollope may well have disliked Yates because he was Sir Rowland's henchman,[43] but his infrequent visits to "The Grand" and the improbability of his knowing Yates in an intimate relation indicate that the association was not colored by the later antagonism. In fact, Trollope's letter of March 11, 1858, implies an informal association in which the older Trollope freely helped the younger man. In the early months of 1858, Trollope, as we saw, was sent on an important postal mission to Egypt; while he was there, Yates made a special, though much less important, trip to the same country:

> My first special journey, however--first and most important--was merely due to my position in the Secretary's office. It was in the year 1858, and the terrible Indian Mutiny was at its height. Submarine telegraphy was in its infancy then, and the number of letters passing between this country and India was so enormously increased that supplementary mails were continually being dispatched. The ordinary Indian mail, made up in air-tight cases, was always sent in charge of special officers appointed for the purpose, and discharging no other duty than that of travelling, with the mails in their custody, from London to Marseilles, and from Marseilles, on board one of the steamers of the P. and O. Company to Alexandria, where the charge was transferred to the officers of the Indian Post Office, who had travelled so far, bringing the homeward letters.[44]

As soon as he heard that he was to make this trip, he wrote "to Anthony Trollope . . . telling him I was coming, and asking him to look out for me."[45] The nature of this request appears to be such that the younger man knew Trollope and that some degree of friendship, however slight, existed between them. Trollope left a letter in which he tried to give Yates the information necessary for an enjoyable and profitable stay in Egypt since he was unable to meet him:

> Alexandria
> 11 March 1858
>
> My dear Yates,
>
> It is a matter of great regret to me that I should miss you. But were I to stay now I should lose my only opportunity of going to Jerusalem. I had hoped to have got there and back before you came out, but it has been impossible for me to start till to-day. I shall probably still see you on the 22nd. At Cairo see (above all) the newly-opened catacombs of Sakkara--by taking a horse and mounted guide you may see that and the Pyramids of Ghizeh in one day. Hear the howling dervishes of Cairo at one on Friday. They howl but once a week, go to the citadel of Cairo, and the mosque of Sultan Hassan. See, also, the tombs of the Caliphs.

> Heliopolis is a humbug, so also is the petrified forest. At Alexandria see the new Greek church they have just excavated. Go to the Oriental Hotel at Alexandria, and Shephard's at Cairo.
>
> Yours ever,
>
> ANTHONY TROLLOPE[46]

The letter was an "admirable product of tabloid tourism,"[47] because Trollope was intent upon helping his acquaintance in every possible way in lieu of his presence. This letter, the single evidence from Trollope's pen from this period, asserts the relation between the men: they knew and hoped to associated with each other with only already made plans preventing their meeting.

One of the most obscure relationships to untangle, and one of the most important, is that of Yates and Thackeray prior to 1858. While Yates cannot be regarded as the most faithful and unbiased of recorders, the account in his autobiography may elucidate a certain degree of familiarity. In the letter of June 13, 1858, which protested Yates's Town Talk article, Thackeray asserted, "I don't remember that out of that Club I ever exchanged 6 words with you."[48] That this statement was written in anger is evident from the circumstances of its composition; therefore, we cannot depend upon its reliability. If Thackeray exaggerated, a fault that is only human in such a situation, the discrepancy between this statement and Yates's testimony may be to some degree resolved.

In the world of London social and club life, Thackeray and Yates were evidently thrown together both before and after the success of Vanity Fair more than Thackeray would have wished to admit. Yates reports that "Thackeray was constantly" present at Evan's cellar supper-and-music rooms, which were also frequented by Albert and Arthur

Smith, Horace Mayhew, Douglas Jerrold, James Hannay, and Augustus Sala,[49] men who never rose above journalism and later resented Thackeray's rise to literary and social prominence.[50] Of those Yates remembers enjoying Evan's "annexe—a comfortable kind of hall, hung with theatrical portraits, &c.—where conversation could be carried on"[51] were several whom Thackeray knew from the early 1840's when he was first connected with Punch; in fact, Thackeray earned a position on the staff after Jerrold and Mark Lemon procured Albert Smith's dismissal in December, 1843.[52] Hence after 1843 there would have been some friction between Thackeray and the Smiths; if Yates's account was meant to include persons who might be seen at Evan's at one time, there would already be antagonisms hidden beneath the surface harmony. Since Thackeray's feud with Jerrold for supremacy at Punch took place in 1846,[53] the most logical time in which Thackeray could have frequented Evan's with these men would have been prior to this literary battle, at a time in which Yates would have been about fifteen years old and unknown except as the son of a fairly prominent family of actors.[54] If Thackeray (who was about thirty-five in 1846) knew Edmund Yates, the relation must have been, even at the most, more the recognition of the son of a late fellow member of the Garrick Club[55] than the friendship of peers. This obscure reference, however, does mean that each of these figures may have known of the existence of the other from a time prior to Thackeray's rise to fame.

Having traveled on the continent after the completion of Vanity Fair (July 2, 1848) and having begun the monthly publication of The History of Pendennis in November,[56] Thackeray was free "from the day-to-day struggle for existence."[57] Already he had subdued Jerrold, whom he saw as "a living warning of the dangers into which ungoverned radicalism could lead."[58] In November, 1836, however, Dickens had written to Jerrold, whom he knew only as the author of the popular comedy, Black-eyed Susan, to obtain an article for Bentley's Miscellany,[59] and by September, 1838, Jerrold was visiting in Dickens's home.[60] Thus by 1846, Jerrold was intimate enough with Dickens to join in protest against Thackeray's attack on radicalism and personally on Jerrold's writings in Punch,[61] and on July 2, 1847, Thackeray expressed his apprehension of this alliance in a letter to Mrs. Carmichael-Smyth, "Jerrold hates me, Ainsworth hates me, Dickens mistrusts me, Forster says I am false as hell, and Bulwer curses me--."[62] This division of the literary figures and journalists into two camps, those favoring Dickens and those favoring Thackeray, began as early as 1846 and was rather definite by the time that Vanity Fair established Thackeray's prominence.[63] In the Garrick Club Dickens, Forster and Jerrold formed a circle which included Albert and Arthur Smith, Andrew Arcedeckne, and Wilkie Collins[64] as well as the comedian John Pritt Harley.[65] Dickens seldom went to the Club even though the Bohemian group regarded him as their leader.[66] By December, 1848, Thackeray had inadvertently alienated not only Douglas Jerrold but also the man who was to be Dickens's biographer, John Forster,[67] with the result that, at least to

some extent, the Club must have begun taking sides. The coincidence of Thackeray's being at Brighton[68] when Edmund Yates's name was proposed for membership in the Garrick Club, therefore, seems to have been premeditated rather than accidental.

Although Yates dates his acquaintance with Dickens as beginning in 1854, his account of this "first" meeting is highly improbable. Since both had been members of the same club for at least five years, Yates's insinuation that he had not seen the novelist becomes questionable. Although they may have been only chance acquaintances before 1854, Yates must have been intimate enough with Dickens for the novelist to attend his son's christening dinner on October 14, 1854, with more incentive than a conversation on one Sunday afternoon and the gift of a book.[69] It might very well have been that, while Yates was not on intimate terms with Dickens until early 1854, the two knew one another through mutual friends and through a speaking acquaintance at the Club. If this is true, the circumstances surrounding Yates's election to the Club and those surrounding his dismissal ten years later are much more closely united than has hitherto been seen.

In his autobiography Yates left an account of his election:

> As soon as I was fairly launched in London, it was my mother's great wish that I should belong to the Garrick Club, of which my father had been an original member; and though I was much under the age prescribed by the regulations, my appearance was that of a full-grown man, and there was little reason to fear that the fact of my having attained my majority would be questioned. Accordingly, I was proposed by the veteran comedian Mr. Harley, and seconded by Andrew Arcedeckne; and being well supported by members who had known my father, I was elected into the Garrick in December, 1848, fully six months before I attained my eighteenth year.[70]

Mr. Ray describes "Albert Smith's set," the Bohemians in the Club, as antagonistic to "the nerves of the quieter and more sedate members."[71] Again Yates misdates the origin of his friendship with Albert Smith:

> About this time, towards the close of the year 1851, I made the personal acquaintance of Albert Smith, with whom I speedily contracted an intimate friendship. . . . I had met him twice previous to this. Early in '47, just after my appointment to the Post Office, and while I was still the rawest of youths. . . .[72]

His silence concerning Albert's membership in the Garrick Club,[73] as in the case of Dickens, seems to have been motivated by a desire to obscure his early affinity with the circle that favored Dickens and opposed Thackeray. Since Yates wrote His Recollections and Experiences in 1884 to justify his youthful behavior, he would hardly admit his friendship with persons known to be antagonistic to Thackeray. But Mr. Harley was a close friend of Dickens, at least close enough for Dickens to dedicate The Village Coquettes to him in 1837,[74] and Mr. Arcedeckne (whom Thackeray was characterizing as Henry Foker in Pendennis)[75] enjoyed a "comic persecution" of Thackeray's dignity at the Club. Despite how good naturedly Arcedeckne might have taken his portrait in Pendennis,[76] the coincidence of his being in the Dickens' circle when he seconded Yates's nomination and Thackeray's being absent appears auspicious. It almost seems as if Yates's election into the Garrick Club was some kind of power play that put Yates in opposition to Thackeray from long before 1858.

Beside the Garrick Club, Yates more than likely met Thackeray at the Fielding Club:

> Just about this time, too—the spring of 1852—was established the original Fielding Club, of which I was a constant attendant, and where I spent many happy hours and made many pleasant and useful acquaintences. . . . The establishment of a night club—the "Fielding" was the name selected by Thackeray, to whom the choice of title was delegated—was decided on in consequence of the impossibility of getting supper at the Garrick, or, indeed, of infusing anything like liveliness into that temple, after midnight.[77]

Thackeray, whose great admiration for Henry Fielding caused him to identify himself with the eighteenth century novelist,[78] evidently did more than merely select the name for the new club; Mr. Elwin gives him credit for founding it in April, 1852,[79] a date which corresponds with Yates's account. If Yates can be trusted, he may have known Thackeray at this club as well as at the Garrick. That he was relatively well acquainted with Thackeray in 1852 accounts for Peter Cunningham's inclusion of Yates in Dickens's dinner for Thackeray in October:

> I had seen Dickens twice before his departure for Paris—once when he presided over a dinner given to Thackeray, immediately before his departure for America, at which through the kindness of Peter Cunningham, who acted as honorary secretary, I managed to be present. It was a most interesting occasion, and Dickens, in proposing the toast of the evening, spoke with much eloquence. Thackeray, too, was plainly moved, so much so that his reply was very short; he tried to pass off his emotion with some joke about the coming voyage and the steward, but it was too much for him.[80]

If further proof is needed to discount Yates's date for meeting Dickens, this statement clearly offers it, since Thackeray departed for America on October 30, 1852. Yates's misrepresentation of factual material

becomes understandable, not only in the light of his desire in 1884 to justify his behavior, but even more so, if his acquaintance with Thackeray extended over several years and if throughout this time he was closely aligned with Dickens. These two occasions in 1852 point to a more intimate acquaintance than Thackeray's angry letter of June 13, 1858, indicates. If Yates can be trusted at all in these references, he seems to have maintained a strange role: he consciously favored Dickens, but to Thackeray he appeared to be neutral, if not slightly leaning to his side.

Yates has only four additional references to Thackeray that can be placed between 1852 and 1858 which are important to the understanding of their relation. The first, an anecdote that puts Thackeray in an unfavorable light, can most easily be discarded:

> I was walking with him [Thackeray] one evening from the club, and, passing a fish-shop in New Street, he noticed two different tubs of oysters, one marked "1s. a dozen," the other "1s. 3d. a dozen." "How they must hate each other!" said Thackeray, pointing them out.[81]

The second presents a greater problem: Yates describes the receptions of Mrs. Milner Gibson, mentioning Thackeray as one of the persons who frequented them and adding that she "never had a reception without sending us a card."[82] Mr. Ray gives credence to the first part of this assertion by stating that Thackeray "was frequently seen at the receptions . . . of Mrs. Milner Gibson (or 'Mrs. Milliner Gibson, as that somewhat overdressed lady was called'), who gave offence in some quarters by her excessive enterprise in attracting intellectual lions

to her salon."[83] Since she may very well have invited the Edmund Yates because of his father's fame, Yates's presence at Mrs. Gibson's salon is likely. If so, Yates and Thackeray, who were both members of the Garrick and the Fielding Clubs, would have further occasion to meet one another. The third reference Yates makes to a familiarity with Thackeray occurred on September 29, 1855, two days after Mrs. Yates was delivered of twins:

> . . . being at the Garrick and seeing Thackeray there, I asked him for an autograph for a book which I had just established. He sat down at once, and wrote the following:
>
> "Michaelmas Day, 1855.
>
> My dear Yates,—Am I to condole with, or congratulate, you, on the announcement in to-day's paper? May every year increase your happiness, and good fortune attend your increase! I know I am writing in an affected manner, as you are pleased to desire my autograph. I assure the friend for whom it is destined that I am quite incapable of being funny on a sudden, easily abashed, of a modest retiring disposition, forty-four old, and—Yours truly, my dear Yates,
>
> W. M. Thackeray.
>
> P.S.—The T of the signature I do not think is near so elegant as my ordinary T's are; in fact, my attention was drawn off just as I was turning it.
>
> E. YATES, Esq. (Private and confidential.)"[84]

Here Thackeray's joviality and self-humor indicate a degree of acquaintance that cannot be explained without reference to the relation of the two men both in the clubs and in social association outside the clubs. Even in a man with Thackeray's disposition to joke,[85] such familiarity in a letter for an autograph book is unusual unless deriving from a personal knowledge of the receiver. Thackeray's remarks on The Train, a periodical that Yates and Sala tried to float in 1856,[86] reveal the same type of familiarity:

> You have a new artist on The Train, I see, my dear Yates! I have been looking at his work, and I have solved a problem. I find there is a man alive who draws worse than myself![87]

In both cases, Thackeray's humor is the ability of a sensitive man to laugh at himself. That he would so expose himself to a mere acquaintance whom he saw only at the Garrick Club is dubious.

The relation between Yates and Thackeray prior to 1858, then, was far from simple. First, Thackeray, twenty years older than Yates, frequented Evans's when Yates was still a boy, but might have known him as the son of Frederick Henry Yates, one of the original members of the Garrick Club. Second, Yates's election to the Garrick was proposed by persons antagonistic to Thackeray at a time when Thackeray was not present. The same group that proposed Yates was aligned with Dickens, and Yates's apparently conscious misrepresentation of his friendship with Dickens indicates his unwillingness to admit that he was in the Smith-Dickens-Jerrold circle prior to, or at the same time as, his election to the Club. Third, Yates was an original member of the Fielding Club that Thackeray helped to found and would have known the older man in this club as well as in the Garrick. Fourth, the attendance of both Yates and Thackeray at social affairs after 1852 indicates the possibility of a greater degree of familiarity than an acquaintance only in clubs. The relation of Yates and Thackeray, therefore, seems to have been on terms far different from those Thackeray insinuates in his letter of June 13, 1858. The most logical approach to Thackeray's affirmation is to say that his discovery of Yates's duplicity came as a

shock to him; apparently he had regarded the younger man as a friend only to discover that Yates's real affinity was with Dickens and to those whom he knew to be his enemies. If the relation between these men was on this basis, Thackeray's motivation in the Garrick Club Affair becomes clearer.

Since it is important for us to trace the origins of Trollope's prejudice against Thackeray's personality, we have established two relations. In the first, we saw that Yates and Trollope were acquainted and by 1858 were on rather intimate relations; in the second, we saw that Thackeray and Yates were drawn closely together by their clubs and social affairs. If Trollope's opinion of Thackeray in the biography of 1879 originated from Edmund Yates, the Garrick Club Affair of 1858 was the dispute that caused Yates, and hence Trollope, to dislike Thackeray's personality. Trollope would have learned the negative opinion either from Yates himself or from the press that supported him; regardless of how the opinion came to him, Trollope's prejudice against Thackeray's personality clearly derives from this period.

On September 9, 1853, Carlyle described Thackeray's character to Emerson after the novelist returned to England from his first American tour:

> Thackeray has very rarely come athwart me since his return: he is a big fellow, soul and body; of many gifts and qualities (particularly in the Hogarth line, with a dash of Sterne superadded), of enormous <u>appetite</u> withal, and very uncertain and chaotic in all points except his <u>outer</u>

> breeding, which is fixed enough, and perfect according to modern English style. I rather dread explosions in his history. A big, fierce, weeping, hungry man; not a strong one.[88]

The "explosion" that Carlyle dreaded might well have been similar to Thackeray's indignation over the article in a small paper, Town Talk, written about him by Edmund Yates. Because this verbal battle, "The Garrick Club Affair," helps us to understand the later relation of Trollope, Thackeray, and Yates, we need to analyze the dispute and its repercussions during the succeeding years. Since Trollope knew Yates and did not know Thackeray at this time and since, except for a short visit to London in July, Trollope was in Scotland, northern England, or Ireland from May 11 until October, 1858, he had no active part in the dispute; however, his image of Thackeray was, as we will see, formed by the Yates-Dickens's side of the quarrel and by the periodical accounts antagonistic to Thackeray.

To set Yates's article into a historical context, it is necessary to understand Thackeray's public image as propagated by the journalists. This image was not drawn totally by those who favored Dickens's, because the Saturday Review, for example, condemned both writers, complaining about Dickens's "vulgarity and emotional radicalism" and Thackeray's "shallowness of 'philosophy.'"[89] Thackeray, nevertheless, had already offended Disraeli in the Morning Chronicle,[90] Bulwer in Fraser's Magazine,[91] Jerrold at the Punch table,[92] Forster in caricatures in private letters, and Charles Lever in Fraser's;[93] hence a considerable number of persons, misunderstanding his humor or his philosophy, were not exactly fond of him. These two groups, those

who disliked Thackeray's literary abilities and those who disliked him for personal reasons, were united in their campaign against him in the periodicals of the 1850's; therefore, the image of Thackeray presented to the public was often unflattering. Thackeray's admirers must not be forgotten, for they also made themselves heard: Charlotte Brontë preferred him to the Crystal Palace,[94] Caroline Fox praised one of his lectures with only slight reservation,[95] and Dr. John Brown condemned Jenny Lind, the Brownings, and Dickens in order to praise him.[96] But, by far, the reviews in the pennyaliners and the cheaper periodicals placed before the public were unfavorable.

The New York Times for October 29, 1855, extensively compared Dickens and Thackeray, exhibiting a rather detailed knowledge of Thackeray's life and a preference for his rival.[97] The writer presented a biased view of Thackeray's art, making such statements as "A highly respectable, gentlemanly selfishness is the alpha and omega of Mr. THACKERAY's code of ethics. . . . THACKERAY's great fault is his total absence of poesy. . . . Mr. THACKERAY has, like most literary men, his peculiar prejudice. His is Anti-Irish." Then the article concluded with an announcement of Thackeray's lectures on The Four Georges:

> We look forward with the keenest relish to his Anatomy of the Four Royal Brutes, he is to have next week under his dissection. They are worthy of his knife, and will doubtless draw crowds of admiring students.[98]

H. S. Maine registered an objection in The Saturday Review of December 15 to the reports of Thackeray's lectures in the American papers: "it is not the act of a good citizen to vituperate with measureless acrimony a King who has been thirty years dead, before an audience which firmly believes that the difference between an Englishman and an American is exclusively caused by the influence exerted over the former by the institution of Kingship." He continues by saying that Thackeray, in his lecture on George IV, "panders, probably without knowing it, to a very popular prejudice."[99] The Saturday Review continued its attack on The Four Georges on January 3, 1857, in an article by T. C. Sandars, who suggests that the lecturer of the future, wishing to give "an effective, if one-sided picture of Victorian England," will only need to tell

> how the greatest humorist of his day— a man in the highest rank of English literature, a gentleman by birth—went from town to town, and rehearsed his admirable productions at the small charge of five shillings a head—how he jested in the most lively way about royalty and episcopacy, and future punishment—and how he was rapturously applauded by a fashionable audience, who privately piqued themselves on nothing more than on being invited, or being nearly invited, to the Queen's balls, and on regular attendance at church, and sound views as to the eternity of damnation.[100]

The reviewer for The Literary Gazette of February 7, 1857, insinuates that Thackeray planned his lectures for the American, "whose abject prostration before the very semblance of rank amazes us of aristocratic Europe" and who either seeks to be descended from nobility or "to snap his fingers at kings and knights, and to find out that they are after

all but pitiful shams."[101] On April 11, 1857, the same periodical claimed that it "cannot be classed among Mr. Thackeray's detractors" but admitted that "we own to have felt somewhat tired and bored by the perpetual flow of sarcasm and vehement denunciation which Mr. Thackeray poured upon the devoted head of the defunct voluptuary George IV ."[102] On November 7, 1857, however, the reviewer for The Literary Gazette found the first number of The Virginians promising,[103] but in January through March, 1858, the periodical took a firm stand against Thackeray's recommendation that a special school be provided for the children of literary men. This type of opposition[104] made him increasingly uneasy and only too glad to give up The Four Georges in June, 1857;[105] that he lost to his Whig opponent when he stood for Parliament in July[106] was, at least to some degree, a result of the unfavorable image of him that these journalists placed before the public. These gleanings help us to perceive the undercurrent of feeling antagonistic to Thackeray at a time when his prominence was firmly established by Vanity Fair, The History of Pendennis, The History of Henry Esmond, and The Newcomes. Thackeray was helpless against this continual attack; he could not strike at his reviewers as long as they remained hidden in the comfortable security of the unsigned column.

In 1855, Edmund Yates developed a scheme that won the approval of the publisher Henry Vizetelly, and on June 30, The Illustrated Times carried the article, "The Lounger at the Clubs," the first personal gossip column.[107] When the staff divided the most prominent men of letters among themselves, Sala wrote on Dickens, James Hannay on

Thackeray, and Yates on Albert Smith; Hannay, however, made "a scathing summary of the merits of the three little essays of famous men--

> Thackeray. By a Scholar.
> Dickens. By a Dickensian.
> Albert Smith. By an Ape."

The union of Hannay (who wrote one of the earliest unauthorized biographies of Thackeray) and Thackeray could only have infuriated the young Yates, and he "paid Hannay in his own coin, and with interest, on a good many occasions."[108] One of these occasions might very well have been Yates's article on Thackeray in Town Talk on June 12, 1858.

While Yates had ample motivation to write the column on Thackeray as a result of his alliance with Dickens, Forster, and Jerrold and because of a personal feud with James Hannay, one of Thackeray's admirers, his version of the composition of the article is probably true:

> About the third week of my engagement [on Town Talk] I went over to the printer's, which was in Aldersgate Street, close by the Post Office, at the close of my official work, to "make up" the paper. All my contribution was in type, and I thought I should only have to remain for half an hour to "see all straight," when I was horrified at hearing from the head-printer that in consequence of illness Mr. Watts Phillips had not sent in his usual amount, and that another column of original matter was absolutely requisite. There was no help for it; I took off my coat--literally, I remember, for it was a warm evening--mounted a high stool at a high desk, and commenced to cudgel my brains.
>
> It happened that in the previous week's number I had written a pen-and-ink sketch of Dickens, which had given satisfaction; I thought I could not do better than follow on with a similar portrait of his great rival.[109]

The image of Thackeray in the article, while very unflattering, reflects the view of those opposed to him; it is a mixture of exaggerations, half-truths, and malicious slander similar to the adverse reviews and comments about Thackeray propagated by his enemies. But Yates is probably truthful in his account of its composition,[110] and in his naive assumption that the article was not "offensive or objectionable, or likely to bring me into trouble."[111] Associating with people antagonistic to Thackeray, despite the acquaintance with the novelist, Yates hastily threw together the impressions that he had picked up both from his relation with Thackeray and from his friends who disliked him. He knew the image of the novelist propagated by this circle and wrote in the vein of the other journalists. That he might well have been attacking James Hannay through Thackeray is possible, but he was covered by the obscurity of anonymity and such an attack could scarcely hurt. Yet Hannay's thrust and Yates's desire to stab back must have been a part of the elaborate chain of events that led to the article. It does not seem probable to assert that Yates's attack on Thackeray was motivated by personal dislike or envy on Yates's part, even though these qualities can be read into the sketch, because Yates is silent concerning events in Thackeray's private life which even the New York Times published and which Yates would surely have known from his relation with Thackeray.[112] It is much more logical to assume that the article is a careless recording of impressions received from periodicals and from persons antagonistic to Thackeray mixed with the remembrance of James Hannay's biting sarcasm. The mistake that Yates made was

innocently to confide in a man at the Garrick Club whom he considered a friend. This unknown man told Thackeray the identity of the author, and for the first time Thackeray definitely knew the man who attacked him.

It is easy to imagine Thackeray's shock and indignation when he discovered that a man he had known, and probably trusted for several years, was the author of a slanderous column about him. As we have seen, the relation of the two men was such that Thackeray was probably quite friendly to his younger contemporary. It is not necessary to assume either that "Yates was moved by an overzealous partisanship for Dickens" or that Thackeray was compelled to place the matter before the Committee of the Garrick Club "by his surmise that Dickens was Yates's active ally."[113] Thackeray's anger at discovering that an acquaintance whom he regarded as a friend had ridiculed him was motive enough for his action:

> Had your remarks been written by a person unknown to me, I should have noticed them no more than other calumnies: but as we have shaken hands more than once, and met hitherto on friendly terms, (You may write to one of your employers, Mr. Carruthers of Edinburgh, & ask whether very lately I did not speak of you in the most friendly manner) I am obliged to take notice of articles wch I consider to be, not offensive & unfriendly merely, but slanderous and untrue.[114]

Only after discovering that his identity was known, did Yates solicit Dickens's aid,[115] yet there is no need to suppose that Thackeray knew or surmised Yates's helper. It was not until November 24 that Dickens confessed to Thackeray his part in the feud,[116] and Thackeray's letter of November 26 expresses his surprise:

> I grieve to gather from your letter that you were Mr. Yates's adviser in the dispute between me and him. His letter was the cause of my appeal to the Garrick Club for protection from insults against which I had no other remedy.[117]

On December 2 Thackeray communicates his shock at Dickens's treachery to Blackwood:

> But the Beauty of Beauties now comes out that Dickens advised Yates throughout Edwin James says wrote every word of Yates's letters. Isn't it a noble creature?[118]

Even if Yates was one of the Dickens's circle, then, it is not necessary to regard Thackeray's anger and persecution of the journalist as "a struggle for supremacy, or an outburst of jealousy between Thackeray and Dickens" in which Yates was merely "the scapegoat or shuttlecock."[119] Yates had acted freely, though naively, in writing the article, not seeking aid from Dickens until Thackeray had discovered his identity, and Thackeray acted from justly hurt feelings because a man he had trusted had proven a traitor to him, not knowing of Dickens's part until after Yates was expelled from the Club and was seeking reinstatement.[120] John Forster's single mention of the Garrick Club Affair in his biography of Dickens seems to be the most just summary of the dispute between Dickens and Thackeray engendered from this clash: "Neither was wholly right, nor was either altogether in the wrong."[121]

This club dispute would be unimportant in a study of Trollope's opinion of Thackeray if it did not have wide publicity at the time. Trollope, it must be remembered, knew Yates but did not know Thackeray; moreover, his absence from London during most of 1858 and early 1859

means that his first knowledge of the affair was through periodicals. Thackeray inadvertently helped the publicity of the scandal by ridiculing Yates as "Young Grubstreet" in the ninth number of The Virginians in July, and the penny press so persecuted Thackeray that finally he spent much of his time on the continent.[122] As early as September 4, 1858, the American miscellany Littell's The Living Age picked up a feature from The Saturday Review, spreading an unfavorable picture of Thackeray across the Atlantic; in this article, sarcastically entitled "Gentlemen Authors," the writer attacks Thackeray, not because Yates was in the right, but because Yates merely printed a "photograph" of a man who earned money selling his features at public lectures. Since the writer sees the entire dispute as Thackeray's objection to a personal description, especially to references to his "bloodless face" and "broken nose," he argued that Thackeray had no grounds for anger--he had already fallen below the level of a gentleman by selling what Yates tried to peddle.[123] In November, The Eclectic Magazine reprinted part of Yates's article,[124] and on March 15, 1859, Littell's The Living Age reprinted a squib from the Home Journal:

> Punch is now not much good, and Thackeray, their next best, is rapidly going down hill as a saleable writer. His "Virginians" has a very small sale--so small that from sheer shame he actually returns some of the stipulated sum paid him by the publishers. The trial brought by Edmund Yates against the Garrick Club for illegally expelling him, as an act of servile flunkeyism to Thackeray, comes on the beginning of next month. In legal circles there is no doubt of Yates's success. The trial will be

> before Lord Campbell, and Edwin James, the queen's counsel, will represent Yates. It is said he intends to put Thackeray into the witness box; and, if so, the charming Titmarsh may expect a ferocious mauling.[125]

Thackeray, of course knowing the limits to which the unflattering publicity was going, made numerous references in his letters to the volume of squibs and articles printed against him:

> August 25, 1858:
> The little papers are still going on abusing me about it I hear--and don't care as I never read one. The public does not care about the story. . . .[126]

> December 2, 1858:
> I wonder who possibly can have written that article in the Scotsman? The other side has been having it all their way for 6 months during wh I have not been allowed to speak one word.[127]

> December 4, 1858:
> The Yates and Thackeray affair still roars on bravely. Three articles this week. Two against me and accusing me of persecuting Yates--private letter from Higgins to tell me I am utterly in the wrong, that Yates's article wasn't malicious. . . .[128]

> March 12, 1859:
> Scores of the pennyaline fraternity have written on his side, and a great number of them are agreed that it's the description of my nose wh makes me so furious--Not one of them seems to understand that to be accused of hypocrisy of base motives for public & private conduct & so forth--are the points wh makes me angry--and I look for more press libels immediately showing how I have ruthlessly persecuted an excellent & harmless young man. . . .[129]

> March 29, 1859:
> . . . the more dignified and I may say sweller course is to hold my tongue, and let the pennyaliners fire away their abuse till the subject dies out.[130]

The trouble with the public image of a man propagated by the press is the difference between that image and the actual man. If there is a discrepancy between the two, as is apparent in this case, we cannot assume that the person, who knew of Thackeray only through the periodical accounts of him, will be able to perceive Thackeray the actual man. Because Thackeray was a great writer, his public image has been redeemed; however, to the contemporary person who knew and admired Thackeray's novels this publicity would have caused a split concept of the novelist: he could be regarded in very favorable light as a literary figure, but disliked as a man. This is precisely the view that Trollope had of Sir Rowland Hill, and, as we shall see, developed concerning Thackeray.

From May 11 until July Trollope was on official postal business in northern England and Scotland, and from August to October he was at home in Ireland; since he left London on November 16 on an official postal mission to the West Indies from which he did not return until the summer of 1859,[131] his knowledge of the Garrick Club Affair could come from only two sources: a chance meeting with Yates when in London in July and November or the periodical account which we just surveyed. Since both sources are highly probable, Trollope was unable to see Thackeray's side of the dispute. The Irish had no love for Thackeray, and since Trollope spent much of his time there, he was more than likely familiar with the Irish view of Thackeray's behavior. In 1839, Thackeray published Catherine, an "Old Bailey novel," in Fraser's Magazine, and in the fifteenth number of Pendennis for April, 1850, he

innocently alluded to the same woman, Catherine Hayes, the murderess. However, a popular Irish soprano, Miss Catherine Hayes, was then performing at the Haymarket Theatre, and the Irish were quite proud of her and of her spotless character.

> A howl of indignation arose from the Hiberian Press, which by-the-way, had not forgotten Thackeray's "Irish Sketch-Book," and his scathing satire in Punch, "The Battle of Limerick." They wholly ignored Catherine Hayes the murderess, and they charged "the Big Blubber Man"--as, with other abusive epithets, they called Thackeray--with wilfully and scandalously libelling the fair fame of Miss Catherine Hayes the vocalist.[132]

The Irish press joined to abuse Thackeray for what it regarded to be an insult to its national pride, and Thackeray was forced to realize as early as 1851 that he was surrounded by enemies.[133] That the Irish press would enjoy a further strike at the novelist naturally follows, so Trollope would see an unflattering picture of Thackeray. If the Irish papers backed Yates and if Trollope knew only Yates's side, any chance meeting with Yates in the Post Office in London would strengthen Trollope's preconception. Trollope's image of Thackeray's personality at this time, therefore, could hardly be fair to the more prominent author; instead Trollope saw Thackeray through the eyes of his opponents, a view that is important if his later relation with Thackeray is to be understood.

The particular coloring of Trollope's view of Thackeray is the result of Trollope's having been influenced by Edmund Yates and those opposed to Thackeray. Because Yates was the middle man who knew both Trollope and Thackeray when they did not know each other, it is not

surprising to find that Trollope based his own opinion of Thackeray on what the younger man said. The surprising thing is that Trollope did not alter his opinion after he knew Thackeray, yet even this is not so surprising when we see the friction that existed between them after they met.

Notes

[1]Recollections and Experiences, I, 278.

[2]Merle Mowbray Bevington, The Saturday Review, 1855-1868: Representative Educated Opinion in Victorian England (New York, 1941), pp. 1-2.

[3]Autobiography, p. 38.

[4]Ibid., pp. 45-46.

[5]Howard Robinson, The British Post Office, A History (Princeton, 1948), pp. 255-256.

[6]Autobiography, pp. 44-45.

[7]Ibid., p. 54.

[8]Michael Sadleir, Trollope, A Commentary (rev. ed.: New York, 1947), pp. 144-145.

[9]Robinson, British Post Office, p. 257.

[10]Quoted from Hill's Post Office Reform in ibid., p. 267.

[11]Ibid., p. 303.

[12]Autobiography, pp. 108-109.

[13]Robinson, British Post Office, p. 327.

[14]Howard Robinson, Britain's Post Office: A History of Development from the Beginnings to the Present Day (London, 1953), p. 154.

[15]Autobiography, pp. 75-76.

[16]Robinson, British Post Office, p. 356.

[17]Autobiography, p. 77.

[18]Recollections and Experiences, II, 222-229.

[19]Sadleir, p. 145.

[20]Trollope was not alone in having difficulty with him: Hill lacked tact and quarreled with a number of Postmaster-Generals under whom he held office. See Robinson, British Post Office, pp. 177-178.

[21]Autobiography, p. 215.

[22]Robinson, Britain's Post Office, pp. 167-168.

[23]Robinson, British Post Office, pp. 333-334.

[24]Trollope Letters, p. 13, fn.3.

[25]Robinson, British Post Office, p. 336.

[26]I have indicated Trollope's opinion of Sir Rowland's character above; Yates must be exaggerating when he describes the Secretary's attitude toward Trollope: ". . . he hated Trollope very cordially and could not avoid showing it when they were brought into contact." Recollections and Experiences, II, 225. Since both men sought the same goal and since Sir Rowland trusted Trollope to make him a special agent in important matters, the "hatred" that existed between the men was not one to be confused with their ability to work together toward a common vision of postal efficiency, even though they obviously differed on the methods that should be employed to obtain that vision.

[27]Autobiography, pp. 104-105.

[28]Recollections and Experiences, I, 83.

[29]Robinson, British Post Office, p. 362, fn.21, and p. 365, fn.28.

[30]Recollections and Experiences, I, 89.

[31]Robinson, British Post Office, p. 418.

[32]Recollections and Experiences, I, 93.

[33]Ibid., 101. The Marquis of Clanricarde was Postmaster-General from 1846-1852.

[34]Ibid., p. 103. The Earl of Hardwicke was Postmaster-General from 1852-1853.

[35]Ibid., II, 90-91.

[36]Robinson, Britain's Post Office, p. 163.

[37]As in the matter of the pillar-boxes cited above.

[38]This sympathy accounts for his unflattering and gently satirical picture of Colonel Maberly in Recollections and Experiences, I, 96-100; it is interesting to note that, while Yates differed from Trollope in his estimate of the man, he yet points out the Colonel's indifference and ridicules his behavior.

[39]Robinson, British Post Office, p. 365.

[40]Autobiography, p. 53.

[41]Tilley became Secretary of the Post Office in 1864 when Sir Rowland retired. Robinson, British Post Office, p. 445.

[42]Recollections and Experiences, II, 222.

[43]Sadleir, p. 204.

[44]Recollections and Experiences, I, 110.

[45]Ibid., I, 111.

[46]Trollope Letters, p. 41. This letter is also quoted in Sadleir, p. 198, and Recollections and Experiences, I, 113-114.

[47]Sadleir, p. 198.

[48]Gordon N. Ray(ed.), The Letters and Private Papers of William Makepeace Thackeray; Collected and Edited by Gordon N. Ray (Cambridge, 1945-1946), IV, 90. Hereafter referred to as Thackeray Letters.

[49]Recollections and Experiences, I, 170.

[50]See Gordon N. Ray, Thackeray: The Age of Wisdom, 1847-1863 (New York, 1958), chapter two. Hereafter referred to as Wisdom.

[51]Recollections and Experiences, I, 170. Also see Wisdom, pp. 343-344.

[52]Adversity, p. 349.

[53]Ibid., p. 367.

[54]Edmund Yates was born on July 3, 1831, the son of Frederick Henry Yates (1795-1842), an actor and part owner of the Adelphi Theatre.

[55]Thackeray joined the Garrick Club on July 22, 1833. Adversity, pp. 167-168.

[56]Malcolm Elwin, Thackeray: A Personality (London, 1932), p. 368.

[57]Wisdom, p. 109.

[58]Adversity, p. 367.

[59]Edgar Johnson, Charles Dickens: His Tragedy and Triumph (New York, 1952), I, 182.

[60]Ibid., p. 220.

[61]Adversity, pp. 372-373.

[62]Thackeray Letters, II, 308.

[63]Adversity, pp. 285-286.

[64]Wisdom, p. 274.

[65]Johnson, I, 211.

[66]Wisdom, p. 275.

[67]Adversity, p. 288.

[68]Elwin, pp. 203 and 269.

[69]Recollections and Experiences, I, 256-259.

[70]Ibid., II, 2.

[71]Wisdom, p. 274.

[72]Recollections and Experiences, I, 224-225.

[73]Albert Smith was a candidate for the Garrick Club in 1850, so Yates must have known him from this time. Ibid., p. 49.

[74]Johnson, I, 185.

[75]Isadore Gilbert Mudge and M. Earl Sears, A Thackeray Dictionary: The Characters and Scenes of the Novels and Short Stories Alphabetically Arranged (London, 1910), p. 100.

[76]Wisdom, pp. 274-275.

[77]Recollections and Experiences, I, 235-236.

[78]Adversity, p. 226.

[79]Elwin, p. 369.

[80]Recollections and Experiences, I, 281-282. George Hodder gives the following account of the dinner: "The project being initiated, Mr. Peter Cunningham undertook the duties of secretary, and all the preliminary arrangements were of the most satisfactory kind, care being taken that the party should be entirely private, and that it should consist exclusively of Mr. Thackeray's intimates." Memories of My Time Including Personal Reminiscences of Eminent Men (London, 1870), p. 257.

[81]Recollections and Experiences, II, 153.

[82]Ibid., I, 253-254.

[83]Wisdom, p. 52.

[84]Recollections and Experiences, I, 280.

[85]Adversity, p. 291.

[86]George Augustus Sala, The Life and Adventures of George Augustus Sala, Written by Himself (London, 1896), pp. 275 and 278.

[87]Recollections and Experiences, I, 336-337.

[88]The Correspondence of Thomas Carlyle and Ralph Waldo Emerson, 1834-1872 (Boston, 1883), I, 262.

[89]Bevington, pp. 182-183.

[90]See his reviews of Coningsby (May 13, 1844) and Sybil (May 13, 1845) reprinted in Gordon N. Ray (ed.), William Makepeace Thackeray: Contributions to the Morning Chronicle (Urbana, 1955).

[91]Adversity, pp. 241-245.

[92]Ibid., pp. 367-373.

[93]Ibid., pp. 286-289.

[94]Letter of May 30, 1851. Muriel Spark (ed.), The Bronte Letters (London, 1954), pp. 185-186.

[95]On June 12, 1851, she entered in the diary: "Went to Thackeray's lecture on the 'Humorists' at Willis's Rooms. It was a very large assembly, including Mrs. Carlyle, Dickens, and unnumerable noteworthy people. Thackeray is a much older-looking man than I had expected; a square, powerful face, and most acute and sparkling eyes, greyish hair and eye brows. He reads in a definite, rather dry manner, but makes you understand thoroughly what he is about. The lecture was full of point, but the subject was not a very interesting one, and he tried to fix our sympathy on his good-natured, volatile, and frivolous Hero rather more than was meet. 'Poor Dick Steele,' one ends with, as one began; and I cannot see, more than I did before, the element of greatness in him." Horace N. Pym (ed.), Memoirs of Old Friends, Being Extracts from the Journals and Letters of Caroline Fox of Penjerrick, Cornwall, from 1835 to 1871 (London, 1882), p. 269.

[96]". . . I heard Jenny Lind and cared nothing for her, I detest Mrs. Browning and Festus, and prefer Thackeray 10 times over to Dickens. . . ." Letter of June 23, 1851, to Lady Trevelyan. John Brown, Letters of Dr. John Brown With Letters from Ruskin, Thackeray, and Others (London, 1907), p. 88.

[97]Apparently the author knew enough about Thackeray to be able to give a sketch of his birth, adolescence, and family; the writer may have been informed of this material by English associates because his being an American is clear from the view point of the article. If the information cited (e.g., Thackeray's gambling and his study for the bar) was common knowledge, the writer's obvious preference for Dickens accounts for the misrepresentation; if the information was not common knowledge, he must have learned of the factual details antagonistic to Thackeray and from English periodicals directed against him.

[98]"Thackeray," The New York Daily Times, V (October 29, 1855), 2. This article was reprinted in Littell's The Living Age, XLVII (December 1, 1855), 562-565.

[99]Quoted from The Saturday Review for December 15, 1855, in Bevington, pp. 168-169.

[100]Quoted from The Saturday Review for January 2, 1859, in ibid., p. 170.

[101]"Mr. Thackeray at the Surrey Gardens," The Literary Gazette, and Journal of Archaeology, Science, and Art, No. 2090 (February 7, 1857), p. 137.

[102]"Mr. Thackeray in Edinburgh," The Literary Gazette, and Journal of Archaeology, Science, and Art, No. 2099 (April 11, 1857), p. 351.

[103]"The Virginians," The Literary Gazette, and Journal of Belles Lettres, Science, and Art, No. 2129 (November 7, 1857), pp. 1065-1066.

[104]I have concentrated only on the reviews of Thackeray's lectures; the reviews of his novels are, on the whole, more favorable. This emphasis on the lectures, however, elucidates Yates's viewpoint concerning Thackeray's ability as a public lecturer in the final paragraph of his Town Talk article.

[105]Wisdom, p. 267.

[106]Ibid., pp. 269-270.

[107]Recollections and Experiences, I, 277-279.

[108]Sala, Life and Adventures, pp. 269-271.

[109]Recollections and Experiences, II, 10.

[110]In a letter of May 25, 1889, Yates tells the same story to Herman Merivale, who was writing a biography of Thackeray: "While the press waited, to supply 'short copy,' at a desk in a printing office, with the master-printer at my elbow, urging me on, slip by slip being carried off to the compositors, as it was written." Thackeray Letters, IV, 133, fn.17.

[111]Recollections and Experiences, II, 13.

[112]"In my wretched nonsense, there is no single reference to Thackeray's home-life, no mention of his Club, no 'gossip' of any kind, no hint--God forbid!--at his domestic trouble, no word of anything that was not thoroughly patent & well known at the time." Letter to Herman Merivale, Thackeray Letters, IV, 133, fn.17.

[113]Wisdom, pp. 278-281.

[114]Letter to Edmund Yates of June 13, 1858. Thackeray Letters, IV, 90.

[115]Recollections and Experiences, II, 18.

[116]Thackeray Letters, IV, 117.

[117]Ibid., p. 118.

[118]Wisdom, p. 285.

[119]Recollections and Experiences, II, 32.

[120]For the chronology of the Garrick Club Affair, see Appendix A.

[121]John Forster, The Life of Charles Dickens (London, 1899), II, 697.

[122]Wisdom, pp. 282-284.

[123]"Gentlemen Authors," Littell's The Living Age, LVIII (September 4, 1858), 742-744.

[124]The Eclectic Magazine of Foreign Literature, Science, and Art, XLV (November, 1858), 434.

[125]"Dickens and His Publishers," Littell's The Living Age, LX (March 5, 1858), 624.

[126]Letter to the Baxters. Thackeray Letters, IV, 109-110.

[127]Letter to Blackwood. Wisdom, p. 285.

[128]Letter to his daughters. Thackeray Letters, IV, 121.

[129]Letter to Charles Kingsley. Ibid., pp. 133-135.

[130]Letter to Duer Robinson. Ibid., p. 135.

[131]Sadleir, p. 407.

[132]Sala, Life and Adventures, p. 82.

[133]Wisdom, pp. 133-135.

CHAPTER II

THACKERAY'S CORNHILL MAGAZINE AND TROLLOPE'S CONTRIBUTION

The thing that brought Thackeray and Trollope together was The Cornhill Magazine, a shilling monthly founded by George Smith. When Thackeray accepted the editorship of the new magazine, he did not know the amount of work that it would demand, but during the latter part of 1859 he threw himself into the task of creating a substantial quality periodical. The news of the forthcoming magazine and Thackeray's request for contributions attracted Trollope's attention, and because he saw in the magazine a chance to break into London's social and literary life when he moved there, Trollope offered some short stories to Thackeray. These stories were not wanted, but Smith and Thackeray immediately accepted him on the staff and asked for a novel. This exchange of letters marks the first personal contact of the two novelists; however, since Trollope approached Thackeray from a subordinate position, he later belittled Thackeray's editorial abilities, claiming that Thackeray was an inferior editor with little talent for the job, in order to build up his own abilities as editor of the ill-fated St. Paul's Magazine.

Before Trollope returned from his postal mission to the West Indies, plans were already underway for this project that was to bring him into association with Thackeray: The Cornhill Magazine, under Thackeray's editorship, was to be published by George Smith beginning

in January, 1860. Since this magazine was the first step toward Trollope's relation with Thackeray, the events of 1859 that led to its birth form the bridge between the view that Trollope received from Yates and that which he developed by 1863, the year of Thackeray's death. The Cornhill, one of the first shilling magazines,[1] owed its inception indirectly to Sir Rowland. In 1848 he had convinced the government that the mails should be opened to books because no other method of delivery effectively reached the rural districts. At first the cost of the Book Post was 6d. a pound with no package containing more than one volume or any writing whatsoever.[2] Meanwhile, the newspaper stamp, the heavy taxation that handicapped the newspapers of the first third of the nineteenth century, had increased from 1½d. in 1780 to 4d. in 1836, and until 1833 a duty of 3s. 6d. was assessed for each advertisement. By 1853 the advertisement duty was abolished, and in 1855 the stamp was discontinued.[3] Sir Rowland's 1848 reform included the newspapers so that by 1855 any newspaper that paid the postage rate was handled by the Book Post. When the rate was lowered in 1855 to four ounces for a penny,[4] the feasibility of a shilling magazine was created. George Smith, an enterprising young publisher who had just prevented his firm's bankrupcy on account of his partner's embezzlement of over £30,000,[5] led Smith, Elder into its first ownership of a newspaper in the same year.[6] But it was not until the early months of 1859 that the idea of a good quality magazine to sell for one shilling "flashed suddenly" into his mind,[7] and the yet-to-be-named Cornhill was born.

Thackeray had first become acquainted with Smith, who hoped to publish his works, when the young publisher invited him to dine with Charlotte Brontë in November, 1849. Even though Miss Brontë and Thackeray failed to become intimate, Smith's bid for Thackeray's work paid off: he published The Kickleburys on the Rhine (1850), Henry Esmond (1852), The English Humourists (1853), and The Rose and the Ring (1855). At the same time Thackeray issued the monthly numbers of The Newcomes (October, 1853-August, 1855) and The Virginians (November, 1857-September, 1859) through his usual publishers, Bradbury & Evans, at one shilling a number.[8] When the idea of a shilling magazine came to Smith, it was accompanied by the shrewd plan to have Thackeray publish an installment of a novel in each issue; therefore, the public would be paying the accustomed price for the monthly numbers of Thackeray's novels and would also be purchasing the magazine.[9]

Having planned the format of the new magazine, George Smith gave Thackeray the following proposals:

> Smith, Elder, & Co. have it in contemplation to commence the publication of a Monthly Magazine on January 1st, 1860. They are desirous of inducing Mr. Thackeray to contribute to their periodical, and they make the following proposal to Mr. Thackeray:
>
> 1. That he shall write either one or two novels of the ordinary size for publication in the magazine--one-twelfth portion of each novel (estimated to be about equal to one number of a serial) to appear in each number of the Magazine.
>
> 2. That Mr. Thackeray shall assign to Smith, Elder, & Co. the right to publish the novels in their magazine and in a separate form afterwards, and to all sums to be received for the work from American and Continental Publishers.

> 3. That Smith, Elder, & Co. shall pay Mr. Thackeray 350£. each month.
> 4. That the profits of all editions of the novels published at a lower price than the first edition shall be equally divided between Mr. Thackeray and Smith, Elder, & Co.
> 65 Cornhill: February 19th, 1859.[10]

Thackeray accepted the offer, and in a letter to his mother of the same month mentioned that he will earn "8500 in the next 2 years from Smith & Elder."[11] Because Thackeray was still being harassed by the Garrick Club Affair, which Yates planned to take to court in March,[12] this generous offer was welcomed; his excitement continued to run high on March 29:

> Then, for next year, I am engaged to write a story [Philip] in 16 numbers for w^h I am to receive—well, more than I have ever received yet by 100£ a number. Think of that! and after a little pause another story. I may want to give up novel-writing but how refuse when I am paid such prodigious sums? Why didn't they buy me at 30, not the tired old horse at 50?[13]

George Smith, however, found himself in a quandary: he had engaged Thackeray to write for the new magazine before he had located an editor. He considered several people, but none responded to his offers. Thomas Hughes, for example, was already obligated to Macmillan and refused. Finally when he had been driven to his "wit's end,"[14] the idea came: "Why not Mr. Thackeray, and you yourself do what is necessary to supplement any deficiencies on his part as a man of business? Think of the writers who would be proud to contribute under his editorship."[15] In a letter of April 14 Thackeray accepted the

position at a salary of £1,000 a year. As evident from his calculations in a letter of October 1 to Mrs. Carmichael-Smyth, he was pleased that he finally had risen to a financially comfortable position:

> If I can work for 3 years now, I shall have put back my patrimony and a little over—after 30 years of ups and downs. I made a calculation the other day of receipts in the last 20 years and can only sum up about 3200£ of moneys actually received—for w^h I have values or disbursements of 13000—so that I havent spent at the rate of more than 1000 a year for 20 years. The profits of the lectures figure as the greatest of the receipts 9500£—Virginians 6—Vanity Fair only 2. 3 years more please the Fates—and the girls will then have the 8 or 10000 a piece that I want for them: and we mustn't say a word against filthy lucre, for I see the use & comfort of it every day more and more. What a blessing not to mind about bills![16]

Before accepting this lucrative position, Thackeray was hesitant: "My Father," Lady Ritchie wrote, "demurred at first to the suggestion of editing the 'Cornhill'. Such work did not lie within his scope, but then Mr. George Smith arranged that he himself was to undertake all business transactions, and my Father was only to go on writing and criticising and suggesting."[17] Under the final arrangement both Smith and Thackeray had to agree on an article before it could be published,[18] a situation that was to irritate Trollope in 1861 and to lead to his comment, "What I wrote for the Cornhill Magazine, I always wrote at the instigation of Mr. Smith."[19] On the whole, the agreement was satisfactory, and Smith was later able to comment, "This relation between publisher and editor would have worked ill in the case of some men, but Thackeray's nature was generous, and my regard for him was so sincere that no misunderstanding ever occurred."[20]

One of the next major problems that confronted Smith and his new editor was the selection of a name for the magazine. On September 29 a name had not yet been found:

> Coire, Switzerland, September 29, 1859.
> Have you found a title? St. Lucius, who founded the church of St. Peter, Cornhill, is buried here. Help us, good St. Lucius! and I will be your faithful W. M. T.[21]

Since the offices of Smith, Elder, & Co. were located at 65 Cornhill, the name, Cornhill Magazine, was appropriate and stuck in Thackeray's mind: "The only name I can think of as yet is 'The Cornhill Magazine.' It has a sound of jollity and abundance about it."[22] By November 1 Smith had agreed upon the name, and in "A LETTER FROM THE EDITOR TO A FRIEND AND CONTRIBUTOR" Thackeray stated his reasons for it:

> Our Store-House being in Cornhill, we date and name our Magazine from its place of publication. We might have assumed a title much more startling: for example, 'The Thames on Fire' was a name suggested; and, placarded in red letters about the City, and Country, it would no doubt have excited some curiosity. But, on going to London Bridge, the expectent rustic would have found the stream rolling on its accustomed course, and would have turned away angry at being hoaxed. Sensible people are not to be misled by fine prospectuses and sounding names; the present Writer has been for five-and-twenty years before the world, which has taken his measure pretty accurately. We are too long acquainted to try and deceive one another; and were I to propose any such astounding feat as that above announced, I know quite well how the schemer would be received, and the scheme would end.[23]

The name of the magazine has remained unchanged up to the present day, even though George Simpson thought, "The title of Thackeray's Magazine conveys to me the idea of Banks, Stockbrokers, and Assurance Companies not of Literature"[24] and some critics sneered at it.[25]

Not only did Thackeray and Smith need to settle the name of the magazine, they had to reach a conception of what the Cornhill was to represent and to find contributors. In both problems, Thackeray was as active as a man in poor health could be. In early September he thought that "the Magazine must bear my cachet . . . and be a man of the world Magazine."[26] Sir Henry Thompson told Lady Ritchie that Thackeray "told me that he intended to develop a new principle--that he thought everyman, whatever his profession, might be able to tell something about it which no one else could say, provided the writer could write at all; and he wanted to utilize this element."[27] To Trollope, Thackeray wrote, "One of our chief objects in this magazine is the getting out of novel spinning, and back into the world."[28] In the circular to prospective contributors, he was more explicit:

> We hope for a large number of readers, and must seek, in the first place, to amuse and interest them. Fortunately for some folks, novels are as daily bread to others; and fiction of course must form a part, but only a part, of our entertainment. We want, on the other hand, as much reality as possible--discussion and narrative of events interesting to the public, personal adventures and observations, familiar reports of scientific discoveries, descriptions of Social Institutions--quicquid agunt homines--a 'Great Eastern,' a battle in China, a Race-Course, a popular Preacher--there is hardly any subject we don't want to hear about, from lettered and instructed men who are competent to speak on it. . . . There are points on which agreement is impossible, and on these we need not touch. At our social table, we shall suppose the ladies and children always present; we shall not set up rival politicians by the ears; we shall listen to every guest who has an apt word to say; and, I hope, induce clergymen of various denominations to say grace in their turn.[29]

Under these directions the Cornhill became a monthly family magazine directed toward an upper-middle class reader.

Thackeray, immediately after accepting the editorship, set to work finding suitable contributors. According to Lady Ritchie, he "thought of articles and wrote letters and made suggestions; he asked people to write for him; he went here and there on purpose to meet likely contributors."[30] Since Thackeray was responsible for a number of The Virginians each month until September,[31] had begun writing Philip for the Cornhill before he became editor,[32] took his daughters on a tour of the continent,[33] and was in poor health,[34] his work on the magazine was only a little less than prodigious. As early as June 27 he was negotiating with Charles Lever,[35] and he "soon had commitments for the early numbers of the Cornhill from such celebrities as Arnold, Mrs. Browning, Bulwer Lytton, Mrs. Gaskell, Lever, Lewes, Ruskin, and Tennyson."[36] As Lady Ritchie has pointed out, "Messrs. Smith & Elder also worked hard and converted their editor's suggestions into facts and reality, with an energy and a liberality very remarkable."[37] In a letter to his sons one of Thackeray's early contributors, G. H. Lewes, described the manner in which the editor solicited his contributor and and the publisher negotiated the payment:

> You have heard I dare say that Mr. Thackeray is about to edit a new Magazine. Well, as soon as he had begun to make arrangements, he wrote to ask me if I would help him. I replied that I should be very willing indeed, if I saw clearly that I could do so, and if the payment was tempting. Whereupon Mr. Smith, the publisher, drove here in his carriage, and made me a tempting offer, which I accepted.[38]

The arduous arrangements, under the circumstances of his illness and other obligations, forced Thackeray to abandon Philip, the novel he was writing for monthly installments in the Cornhill; on August 23 he and Smith had reached an alternative plan:

> For the new Magazine we are going to turn the Comedy into a story in 6 numbers to be followed by the 4 Georges in 4 numbers—and not begin the long story until July.[39]

As agreed, Thackeray turned The Wolves and the Lamb into the short, "comparatively unimportant story, 'Lovel the Widower.'"[40] He knew the weakness of the story and was, therefore, glad to welcome Anthony Trollope to his staff if the latter could supply a novel before the copy for the first number went to the printer in December.

When he returned to England from the West Indies in the summer of 1859, Trollope requested a transfer to England. His work was of such a nature that he was often away from Dublin, his home, and a transfer to the vicinity of London would unite his family and place him "within the reach of the publishers, the clubs, and the dinner-parties of the metropolis."[41] When his request was granted, he searched for a place to live that could be close to London and still preserve the rural atmosphere of Ireland. By August 2 he was able to tell his wife that a place had been leased:

> To ye ladie of Waltham House in ye Countie of Herts. These—
> Deareste Madame
> Havinge withe infinite trouble & pain inspected & surveyed and poked manie and diverse holes in ye aforesaid mansion, I have at ye laste hired and taken it for y^{r} moste excellente ladieship—to have and to hold from ye term of St Michaels mass next

> comynge. The whiche Waltham House is now the property of one Mistress Wilkins, who has let it to your lovynge lord & husband for 7—14— or 21 years, with manie and diverse clauses which shall hereafter as time may serve be explained to your excellente ladieship—[42]

Mr. Sadleir has described Waltham House, at Waltham Cross in Hertfordshire, as "a fine Georgian house of weathered brick, which had in those days a large garden, good stabling and surroundings of great rural beauty."[43] In his autobiography Trollope described the advantages that the new residence was to bring him:

> In December 1859, while I was still very hard at work on my novel [Framley Parsonage], I came over to take charge of the Eastern District, and settled myself at a residence about twelve miles from London, in Hertfordshire, but on the borders both of Essex and Middlesex,— which was somewhat too grandly called Waltham House. This I took on lease, and subsequently bought after I spent about £1000 on improvements. From hence I was able to make myself frequent both in Cornhill and Piccadilly, and to live, when the opportunity came, among men of my own pursuit.[44]

The move to Waltham House opened the London world to Trollope, while he continued to have the rustic pleasures that Ireland had offered:

> I was now settled at Waltham Cross, in a house in which I could entertain a few friends modestly, where we grew our cabbages and strawberries, made our own butter, and killed our own pigs. I occupied it for twelve years, and they were years to me of great prosperity.[45]

But this new world was not dependent alone upon the change of residence; much of it derived from his acquaintance with Thackeray. With characteristic energy Trollope filed official reports, made arrangements to move from Ireland, and on August 4 began composing a

new novel for Chapman & Hall, his publishers. After the transfer was definite and the lease on Waltham House had been obtained, Trollope heard of Thackeray's new magazine:

> . . . even in Ireland, where I was still living in October, 1859, I had heard of the Cornhill Magazine, which was to come out on the 1st of January 1860, under the editorship of Thackeray.

To be on the staff of a new and promising London periodical meant to Trollope an entrance into the hitherto closed literary world. He had "written from time to time certain short stories, which had been published in different periodicals," and hoping to make an acquaintance with one of the top literary figures, he offered some stories to Thackeray, whom he had never seen.[46] On October 23 he wrote Thackeray from Dublin modestly offering his services to the magazine:

> Dear Sir,
>
> I do not know how far the staff of your new periodical may be complete. Perhaps you will excuse my taking the liberty of offering to make one of the number if it may be not so.
>
> I will tell you exactly what would be my views, and you will as frankly tell me whether they would suit you.
>
> I am writing a series of stories to be called—unless I change the name, Tales of all countries. I began them last summer with the view of publishing them first in Harpers magazine, & then of republishing them here. He has two of them already in his hands.
>
> My idea is to publish one a month, & to republish the 12 in a single vol at the end of a year. They wd run in this way for two years. They would occupy, each, from 8 to 13 pages of a big-paged magazine—such as yours may probably be.
>
> If it suited you to take one each alternate month, I would send one for each alternate month to Harpers. It does not suit him to have to take one monthly—or I would send them all to you, if you so wished.

> If this idea would suit you, you would probably let me know your rate of pay. Harper gives me £20 for each story--or £2 a page for 10 pages. Of course I have the right of republication whenever it may suit me.
>
> I have five of these stories now by me. Each refers to or is intended to be redolent of some different country--but they apply only to localities with which I am myself conversant.
>
> You will I hope at any rate excuse my writing to you in this manner.
>
> Yours faithfully
>
> ANTHONY TROLLOPE
>
> As I have before me a letter from Harper respecting these stories which I must answer, perhaps you will let me have a reply as soon as may be convenient to you.[47]

When Trollope's letter reached London, his proposal instantly received attention. Thackeray and Smith, however, needed a novel to supplement Lovel the Widower, not the short articles Trollope offered. Since Thackeray's reply was dated October 28, five days after Trollope's had been written, and followed Smith's proposals, the idea to ask Trollope for a lead novel must have been instantaneous. Thackeray, since he also was to feature a novel, tactfully allowed time for Smith's letter to be in the mail before he wrote. According to Trollope, the letter from Smith offered "£1000 for the copyright of a three-volume novel, to come out in the new magazine,—on condition that the first portion of it should be in their hands by December 12th."[48] Thackeray's letter immediately followed, welcoming Trollope to the staff and containing the printed circular, A LETTER FROM THE EDITOR TO A FRIEND AND CONTRIBUTOR:

> My dear Mr. Trollope,—Smith & Elder have sent you their proposals; and the business part done, let me come to the pleasure, and say how very glad indeed I shall be to have you as co-operator in our new magazine. And looking over the annexed programme, you will see whether you can't help us in many other ways besides tale-telling. Whatever a man knows about life and its doing, that let us hear about. You must have tossed a good deal about the world, and have countless sketches in your memory and your portfolio. Please to think if you can furbish up any of these besides a novel. When events occur, and you have a good lively tale, bear us in mind. One of our chief objects in this magazine is the getting out of novel spinning, and back into the world. Don't understand me to disparage our craft, especially your wares. I often say I am like the pastry-cook, and don't care for tarts, but prefer bread and cheese; but the public love the tarts (luckily for us), and we must bake and sell them. There was quite an excitement in my family one evening when Paterfamilias (who goes to sleep on a novel almost always when he tries it after dinner) came upstairs into the drawing-room wide awake and calling for the second volume of The Three Clerks. I hope the Cornhill Magazine will have as pleasant a story. And the Chapmans, if they are the honest men I take them to be, I've no doubt have told you with what sincere liking your works have been read by yours very faithfully,
>
> W. M. Thackeray.[49]

Trollope was delighted, but the "suddenness of the call" found him unprepared:

> It was already the end of October, and a portion of the work was required to be in the printer's hands within six weeks. Castle Richmond was indeed half written, but that was sold to Chapman. And it had already been a principle with me in my art, that no part of a novel should be published till the entire story was completed. I knew, from what I read from month to month, that this hurried publication of incompleted work was frequently, I might perhaps say always, adopted by the leading novelists of the day.[50]

When he had decided to break his principle, he went to London to make final arrangements. Arriving on the morning of November 3, he had finished plotting Castle Richmond and went first to Edward Chapman to break his arrangement with Chapman & Hall in the case that this Irish novel suited the Cornhill. With an agreement made, Trollope had his "first interview with Mr. George Smith," who wanted "an English tale, on English life, with a clerical flavour."[51] Smith's rejection of a novel dealing with Ireland reflected his concern with the English public. Trollope's early Irish novels, The Macdermots of Ballycloram (1847) and The Kellys and the O'Kellys: or Landlords and Tenants (1848), as well as Castle Richmond (1860), "brought to the Irish novel an objectivity which not even Maria Edgeworth could match, yet he was almost as close to the peasants as Carleton or the Banims."[52] The intellectual climate in England, however, formed the basis for Smith's refusal of Castle Richmond; the Stebbinses describe the attitude toward the Irish in England in the following paragraph:

> Such bitter food was not relished in England. Had Ireland been in a less unhappy state when Castle Richmond was published, English readers could have been comfortable in the thought that twelve years had passed since these poor wretches starved to death. As it was, they could not pick up a daily paper without seeing reference to current evils in that luckless country. Rents had continued to rise, landlords to be extortionate, taxes to increase, and the endless quarrel between Catholics and Protestants had waxed in bitterness. A strong police force was ineffectual in subduing malcontents. Across the Atlantic, especially in New York, Irish emigrants who had left the country in the dreadful years of dearth had grown rich and were sending money home to foment disorder. The Fenian Society had declared its purpose of setting up an independent Irish republic. Victorians disliked depressing novels based on truths which pricked at conscience.[53]

Wanting to accept Smith's generous offer ("The price . . . was more than double what I had yet received"),[54] Trollope began Framley Parsonage on the night of November 4 on the "journey back to Ireland, in the railway carriage."[55]

Although Trollope had never written for serialization before and had initial misgivings over the change of style that it demanded,[56] he stopped work on Castle Richmond until Framley Parsonage was half-finished.[57] Since he resumed work on the Irish novel on January 1, 1860,[58] the portion that he placed in Smith's hands must have been considerable. Smith himself could hardly be anything but surprised at the speed of Trollope's work, but Trollope, who was as methodical a writer as England has yet produced, had prepared a plan for the writing of novels before his mission to Egypt:

> When I have commenced a new book, I have always prepared a diary, divided into weeks, and carried it on for the period which I have allowed myself for the completion of the work. In this I have entered, day by day, the number of pages I have written, so that if at any time I have slipped into idleness for a day or two, the record of that idleness has been there, staring me in the face, and demanding of me increased labour, so that the deficiency might be supplied. According to the circumstances of the time,—whether my other business might be then heavy or light, or whether the book which I was writing was or was not wanted with speed,—I have allotted myself so many pages a week. The average number has been about 40. It has been placed as low as 20, and has risen to 112. And as a page is an ambiguous term, my page has been made to contain 250 words; and as words, if not watched, will have a tendency to straggle, I have had every word counted as I went. In the bargains I have made with publishers I have,—not, of course, with their knowledge, but in my

> own mind,--undertaken always to supply them with so many words, and I have never put a book out of hand short of the number by a single word. I may also say that the excess has been very small. I have prided myself on completing my work exactly within the proposed dimensions. But I have prided myself especially in completing it within the proposed time,--and I have always done so. There has ever been the record before me, and a week passed with an insufficient number of pages has been a blister to my eye, and a month so disgraced would have been a sorrow to my heart.[59]

Elsewhere he confided that he had the custom "to write with a watch before me, and to require from myself 250 words every quarter of an hour. I have found that the 250 words have been forthcoming as regularly as my watch went."[60] Between the details of his postal work and the confusion of the move to Waltham House, therefore, Trollope managed to have copy in Smith's hands early enough that he could return the proofs on November 25.[61]

Thackeray and Smith had a hectic time as the dead line for the first number neared,[62] but on December 15 Thackeray wrote to Mrs. Tennyson, "Hip Hip Hurray. Our number is gone to press. . . ."[63] On December 25 Trollope, now living at Waltham Cross, had already received his payment and asked Smith whether the check was not too large, adding his congratulations on the first number.[64] Thackeray was pleased when he received an early copy on December 20,[65] as were the contributors who also received advanced copies. Richard Monckton Milnes, for example, wrote Thackeray on December 27 to congratulate him for a magazine "almost too good for the public it is written for and the money it has to earn."[66] Trollope wrote to the editor on December 28, adding his praises to the others:

> My dear Sir,
>
> Allow me to congratulate you on the first number of the magazine. Putting aside my own contribution, as to which I am of course bound to say nothing laudatory whatever I may think, I certainly do conceive that nothing equal to it of its kind was ever hitherto put forth—
>
> The great aim in such a work should be, I think, to make it readable, an aim which has been so constantly lost sight of in a great portion of the pages of all magazines. In your first number there is nothing that is not readable—with the single exception above mentioned;—and very little that is not thoroughly worth reading.
>
> Very faithfully yours
> ANTHONY TROLLOPE
>
> W. M. Thackeray Esq[67]

The first number of the Cornhill, that excited such laudatory exclamations, was a modest little magazine with a yellow cover designed by Godfrey Sykes, a student at the school of art which had recently been established under the protection of the Prince Consort at South Kensington.[68] The cover was not decided upon until November after Thackeray had tried in vain to find an artist or to design one himself:

> I have been with Mr. Keene [cartoonist for Punch] and pressed him in vain. His hands he says are quite too full. I spent a great part of yesterday at the Museum trying if I could devise a title page myself but this morning bethought that my friend Mr. Cole at the Boilers [South Kensington Schools of Art] might find an artist to my purpose. He introduced me to a gentleman there of the very highest skill to whom I explained the design we wanted, who took immediately my view of it and will bring me a drawing as soon as done.[69]

Although another design had been tentatively chosen, Syke's drawing was immediately selected: "What a fine engraving! what a beautiful drawing!" Thackeray wrote; "there has been nothing so ornamentally good done anywhere that I know of."[70] If the cover was pleasing to the

eye, the contents were delightful to the mind. In the 128 pages of the large, extremely readable type was a liberal feast fit for any palate, prepared by amateurs and professionals alike, and presented to the public without signatures. The contents alone reveal the fulfillment of Thackeray's desire to make the Cornhill "a man of the world Magazine":

[Anthony Trollope.] Framley Parsonage.
Chapter 1. "Omnes omnia bona dicere." Chapter 2. The Framley Set and the Chaldicotes Set.
Chapter 3. Chaldicotes. 1
[Sir John Bowring.] The Chinese and the Outer Barbarians 26
[W. M. Thackeray.] Lovel the Widower.--Chapter 1. The Bachelor of Beak Street. 44
[G. H. Lewes.] Studies in Animal Life--Chapter 1. . .61
Father Prout's Inauguration Ode to the Author of "Vanity Fair." 75
[Sir John Burgoyne.] Our Volunteers 77
[Thornton Hunt.] A Man of Letters of the Last Generation 85
[Allen Young.] The Search for Sir John Franklin (from the Private Journal of an Officer of the Fox). 96
[Mrs. Archer Clive.] The First Morning of 1860. . . 122
[W. M. Thackeray.] Roundabout Papers.--No. 1 On a Lazy Idle Boy . . . . . 124[71]

In this table of contents the Cornhill offered fiction, poetry, the personal essay, the scientific essay, the adventure narrative, and a patriotic appeal to oppose the French. Between Thackeray and Smith the new magazine had become not just a reality but a periodical of outstanding promise.

The public reception was immediate and far excelled the wildest dreams of its editor or publisher:

> The day when the first number was published--January 1860--messengers arrived to tell the editor of the new thousands being wanted by the public; then more messengers came, and we were told how the printers were kept working till all hours. . . . Mr. George Smith[72] told me that the calculations were all put out by the enormous sale, which reached to some 120,000.[73]

No more than 80,000 copies had been ordered, but the great sale was "without precedent in English periodical literature"[74] and meant that half a million people read the first number.[75] Financially, however, this unexpected success caused the publisher to lose money:

> The calculations for the advertisements were all put out by the enormous sale. The price which pays for 10,000 announcements and the paper and the printing ceases to be remunerative when 120,000 notices are put forth. The proprietors actually lost upon the transactions after a certain number had been reached.[76]

Despite this initial loss Smith had the foresight to rejoice over the prospects of the magazine. The entry for January 3, 1860, in his diary succinctly stated, "Called on Thackeray on my way to the City; signed agreement respecting 'Roundabout Papers.' Mr. Thackeray in very good spirits at the success of the 'Cornhill.'"[77] Perhaps, this meeting was also the time when Smith doubled Thackeray's salary, an offer that caused Thackeray's income from the magazine to rise to £600 a month.[78] At the end of the month Smith knew better how to estimate sales: on January 27 he "ordered 80,000 to be printed. Called in Bride Lane to see how they were selling the second number of the 'magazine.' The demand very rapid," and on January 30 he "ordered 100,000 to be printed. . . ."[79] The editor and the publisher could

hardly be anything but elated over the fruits of their toil in 1859, and even when the circulation dropped to an average of 85,000 copies a month, they could still pride themselves at surpassing the rival shilling magazine Macmillan's.[80]

Because the editorship of an unexpectedly popular magazine was a new experience for Thackeray, his role was often difficult. On the one hand, Thackeray's suggestions to would-be contributors were parried by such replies as Motley's refusal:

> I feel sure that I should be voted a bore were I to try my hand as you desire. Believe me that it is from no affectation or modesty, nor indisposition to oblige you, that I thus refuse your invitation, but from an honest inward conviction of imbecility.[81]

On the other hand, the sensitive Thackeray squirmed in his position when he was faced to reject material submitted but not suitable for the magazine. For example, when Mrs. Browning contributed "Lord Walter's Wife,"[82] Thackeray cried, "Who am I to refuse the poems of Elizabeth Browning, and set myself up as a judge over her?" In his letter to her, he painfully described the reasons for his rejection:

> You see that our Magazine is written not only for men and women, but for boys, girls, infants, sucklings almost, and one of the best wives mothers, women in the world, writes some verses, wh I feel certain would be objected to by many of our readers--Not that the writer is not pure, and the moral most pure chaste and right--but there are things my squeamish public will not hear on Mondays though on Sundays they listen to them without scruple. In your poem you know there is an account of unlawful passion felt by a man for a woman--and though you write pure doctrine and real modesty and pure ethics, I am sure our readers would make an outcry, and so I have not published this poem.[83]

While Mrs. Browning sent another contribution, "Little Mattie," "to prove that I am not sulky," she defended herself by adding,

> I am not a 'fast woman'—I dont like coarse subjects, or the coarse treatment of any subject—But I am deeply convinced that the corruption of our society requires, not shut doors and windows, but light and air—and that it is exactly because pure & prosperous women choose to ignore vice, that miserable women suffer wrong by it everywhere. Has paterfamilias, with his Oriental traditions and veiled female faces, very successfully dealt with a certain class of evil? What if materfamilias, with her quick pure instincts and honest innocent eyes, do more towards their expulsion by simply looking at them & calling them by their names—[84]

But Mrs. Browning's reaction would have been a relief compared to Thackeray's continual uneasiness when he rejected material, especially material submitted by young ladies.[85] Thackeray himself characterized "the thorn in the cushion of the editorial chair" in his fifth Roundabout Paper (July, 1860):

> Ah! It stings me now as I write. It comes with almost every morning's post. At night I come home, and take my letters up to bed (not daring to open them), and in the morning I find one, two, three thorns on my pillow. Three I extracted yesterday; two I found this morning. They don't sting quite so sharply as they did; but a skin is a skin, and they bite, after all, most wickedly. It is all very fine to advertise on the Magazine, "Contributions are only to be sent to Messrs. Smith, Elder, & Co., and not the Editor's private residence." My dear sir, how little can you know man- or woman-kind, if you fancy they will take that sort of warning! How am I to know (though, to be sure, I begin to know now), as I take the letters off the tray, which of those envelopes contains a real bonâ fide letter, and which a thorn? One of the best invitations this year I mistook for a thorn-letter, and kept it without opening. This is what I call a thorn-letter:—

"CAMBERWELL: June 4

"SIR,—May I hope, may I entreat, that you will favour me by perusing the enclosed lines, and that they may be found worthy of insertion in the Cornhill Magazine? We have known better days, sir. I have a sick and widowed mother to maintain, and little brothers and sisters who look to me. I do my utmost as a governess to support them. I toil at night when they are at rest, and my own hand and brain are alike tired. If I could add but a little to our means by my pen, many of my invalid's wants might be supplied, and I could procure for her comforts to which she is now a stranger. Heaven knows it is not for want of will or for want of energy on my part that she is now in ill-health, and our little household almost without bread. Do—do cast a kind glance over my poem, and if you can help us, the widow, the orphans will bless you! I remain, sir, in anxious expectancy, your faithful servant,

S.S.S."

And enclosed is a little poem or two, and an envelope with its penny stamp—Heaven help us!—and the writer's name and address.

Now you see what I mean by a thorn.[86]

As Thackeray's health failed, this part of the work became more and more irksome to him.[87] Smith could not even call him a good editor when it came to rejections, because Thackeray was "uncertain and wayward, far too tender-hearted—could not say 'No' to a contributor."[88]

Beside the troubles he faced soliciting articles and rejecting unsuitable material, Thackeray had two other procedures that harmed his efficiency as an editor. Lady Ritchie relates that, after he asked Sir Henry Thompson "to describe cutting off a leg as a surgical operation," he lost the manuscript for three months so that it did not appear until the fourth number with the mild title "Under Chloroform."[89] An editor who misplaces a manuscript, especially one that was solicited, can scarcely be regarded as efficient. Also as Robertson Scott has pointed

out Thackeray's method of correcting contributions was not designed to save his publisher's profits: he corrected, not the manuscripts or the galley proofs, but the page proofs, the most costly to work with, for if a sizable passage were deleted, the pagination and the contents of each following page in the feature would have to shift position.[90]

Even if Thackeray fell down in the mechanical part of his work, his artistic contribution to the Cornhill balances, if not overshadows, his faults. Beside his contributions of the two novels, Lovel the Widower and The Adventures of Philip,[91] twenty-eight Roundabout Papers, The Four Georges, and seven other articles,[92] Thackeray often revised the material of his contributors. In the jubilee edition of the Cornhill (January, 1910) was printed a facsimile of three pages of a story which Thackeray has revised and altered. Thackeray's pen has touched extensive passages, concentrating on diction and word choice as well as on grammar and word order. Because he was not always competent to do the revision himself, he sometimes suggested to the contributor the manner in which the material should be altered:

> The verses are so good that they ought to be
> better. Why leave careless and loose rhymes
> such as those marked? Why not polish the verses
> more and more and make them as bright as they
> possibly can be? . . . .
> vows so dear and
> Not hear the passionate words so fondly told
> (2)
> For all my soul goes sorrowing to behold
> How much &c.
> 5 x grasping pen? & mine & thine are but poor rhymes
> 7 stars, futurity
> 10. sea, me, see, be. The whole stanza is obscure.
> earthly sea specially obscure.
> 17 Go then! & take with thee &c
> 7 Dimmed with a mist of tears my eyes I raise
> Two tearful stars are all my eyes can see
> But thine into futurity should gaze[93]

The careful work that is exhibited here seems to overbalance the faults Thackeray exhibited in the more mechanical aspects of editorship. In a modern magazine staff he would probably be a very good literary editor, leaving the other side of the work to a managing editor, but in the nineteenth century one man was expected to fulfill both roles.

Despite the initial high sales and the care he exerted to make the Cornhill a quality magazine, Thackeray was beset by troubles more serious than having to reject young ladies' contributions or revise poor material to make it suitable. His enemies of the Garrick Club Affair continued to harass him. On November 17, 1859,[94] Yates, apparently hoping to end the animosity that had been generated by his earlier indiscretion, sent Thackeray a poem. This rash movement led to what Yates should have expected when his poem was mailed: "It came back by return of post, with a line of his secretary, who was 'desired by Mr. Thackeray to return the enclosed.'"[95] This was probably the easiest rejection Thackeray was able to make. But Yates was not the only person whom Thackeray feared; the powerful coalition of the Dickens's clique and the penny papers presented a united front against him. In 1859 he had been afraid that "Forster will try to prevent Tennyson from writing for [Samuel Lucas, who was apparently employed by Smith, Elder when the first number of the Cornhill was being prepared]."[96] Then the greatest attack came, not from individual enemies, but from the Saturday Review. The first two members of the Saturday Review staff to desert the staff were Henry Sumner Maine and Fitzjames Stephen, elder brother of Leslie Stephen. Stephen "contributed two articles to

The Cornhill Magazine in 1860 and eight or nine during each of the next three years."[97] Beresford Hope of the Saturday Review commented about him:

> Meine and Stephen enticed over to the Cornhill by Thackeray, like a jobber as he is. Stephen, who is avid of money, agreed without Cook's knowledge to write a continuous series for the Cornhill, which is obviously treason, and he has got his dismissal accordingly.[98]

Earlier the Saturday Review had favored Thackeray over Dickens, but in 1860 they joined the nebulous group that opposed the editor of the Cornhill.[99] When Thackeray mentioned the Saturday Review in "Nil Nisi Bonum" (February, 1860) he was highly complimentary: "It is a good sign of the times when such articles as these (I mean the articles in the Times and Saturday Review) appear in our public prints about our public men. They educate us, as it were, to admire rightly."[100] In another Roundabout Paper, "De Juventute" (October, 1860), however, Thackeray, who had by now enough of the Saturday Review's attacks, struck back by satirizing their position:

> It is the Superfine Review. It inclines to think that Mr. Dickens is not a true gentleman, that Mr. Thackeray is not a true gentleman, and they when the one is pert and the other is arch, we, the gentlemen of the Superfine Review, think, and think rightly, that we have some cause to be indignant. The great cause why modern humour and modern sentimentalism repel us, is that they are unwarrantably familiar. Now, Mr. Sterne, the Superfine Reviewer thinks, "was a true gentleman, because he was above all things a true gentleman." The flattering inference is obvious: let us be thankful for having an elegant moralist watching over us, and learn, if not too old, to imitate his high-

> bred politeness and catch his unobtrusive grace. If we are unwarrantably familiar, we know who is not. If we repel by pertness, we know who never does. If our language offends, we know whose is always modest.[101]

In "Small Beer Chronicle" (July, 1861) Thackeray hit again:

> A short while since, a certain Reviewer announced that I gave myself great pretensions as a philosopher. I a philosopher! I advance pretensions! My dear Saturday friend, And you? Don't you teach everything to everybody? and punish the naughty boys if they don't learn as you bid them?[102]

While such thrusts might appear in Thackeray's skilled hands to be humorous, the adverse attacks were among the "thorns in the cushions" that he could best stop through slighting; as early as July, 1860, he declared:

> . . . it is not the fire of adverse critics which affects or frightens the editorial bosom. They may be right; they may be rogues who have a personal spite; they may be dullards who kick and bray as their nature is to do, and prefer thistles to pineapples; they may be conscientious, acute, deeply learned, delightful judges, who see your joke in a moment, and the profound wisdom lying underneath. Wise or dull, laudatory or otherwise, we put their opinions aside.[103]

The Saturday Review and Thackeray, however, both held as an ideal the middle class gentleman; it was the Bohemian circle that had sided with Yates that was particularly offensive.[104] The relation between the Saturday Review and the editor of the Cornhill had a basis other than this personal animosity, but when it finally entered the fight between the obscure papers and Thackeray, it was to raise the great Titmarsh to his full wrath.

Since the Cornhill was the medium that brought Trollope and Thackeray together, Trollope's views on Thackeray as an editor are especially interesting. We have seen how Trollope earned, much to his surprise, a major place on the magazine's staff and how his relation to the Cornhill was primarily through George Smith. Furthermore, we have seen that Trollope was in a position more to hear of Yates's side of the Garrick Club Affair than to sympathize with Thackeray. From these premises we can assume that Trollope, who did not yet know Thackeray, may already have formulated the divided image of him that was to become apparent in the biography of 1879. In his autobiography (written between October, 1875, and April 30, 1876), when Trollope accounts for the manner in which Framley Parsonage came to be placed first in a magazine originally intended to have its main stay in a serialization by Thackeray:

> . . . the answer to this question must be found in the habits of procrastination which had at that time grown upon the editor. He had, I imagine, undertaken the work himself, and had postponed its commencement till there was left to him no time for commencing. There was still, it may be said, as much time for him as for me. I think there was,—for though he had his magazine to look after, I had the Post Office. But he thought, when unable to trust his own energy, that he might rely upon that of a new recruit.[105]

Obviously Trollope, while praising his own unusual capacity for work, never learned the burdens under which Thackeray worked in 1859. He has forgotten that while Thackeray had to finish The Virginians for Bradbury & Evans, he was working on the Cornhill, and on top of this

work was in chronically poor health. In Thackeray (1879) Trollope is more lenient in his charges, perhaps because unlike An Autobiography it was to be published during the author's lifetime:

> I was astonished that work should be required in such haste, knowing that much preparation had been made, and that the service of almost any English novelist might have been obtained if asked for in due time. It was my readiness that was needed, rather than any other gift! The riddle was read to me after a time. Thackeray had himself intended to begin with one of his own great novels, but had put it off till it was too late. Lovel the Widower was commenced at the same time with my own story, but Lovel the Widower was not substantial enough to appear as the principal joint at the banquet. Though your guests will undoubtedly dine off the little delicacies you provide for them, there must be a heavy saddle of mutton among the viands prepared. I was the saddle of mutton, Thackeray having omitted to get his joint down to the fire in time enough. My fitness lay in my capacity for quick roasting.[106]

Apparently Trollope did not know, or chose to forget, Thackeray's beginning of Philip and the alteration of The Wolves and the Lamb into Lovel the Widower. His ignorance concerning Thackeray's occupations in 1859 and Thackeray's plan to run Lovel the Widower as his novel has caused him to slant the accounts in such a way that Thackeray comes out on the small end while he takes the praise upon himself. Lewis Melville attacks Trollope's position by asserting

> Thackeray . . . had made no default, for "Lovel the Widower" was the story he had intended to contribute, and the invitation to Trollope arose from the proprietor's belief that a second serial would strengthen the magazine. "Framley Parsonage" was given the place of honour in the new periodical, indeed, and it was this that led Trollope to a mistaken conclusion; but that was by Thackeray's

> own arrangement on grounds of courtesy. "He would not claim the first place in his own magazine," George Smith has explained, "He looked upon himself as a host, and upon Trollope as his guest."[107]

The point to be made is that Trollope did not know Thackeray's side of the question nineteen years later, after they had supposedly been close friends for years. Had their friendship been "one of the finest and most generous friendships in English letters,"[108] it is, to say the least, surprising that Trollope never understood why he had been chosen to write a novel for the Cornhill, the magazine that introduced him to Thackeray.

Trollope's opinion of Thackeray's abilities as an editor are also pertinent. By the time that he wrote the biography, Trollope himself had experienced the editor's "throne." On October 1, 1867, St. Paul's Magazine was launched with Trollope in "complete freedom of editorial control,"[109] and in March, 1870, he resigned. In his autobiography he excused the failure of St. Paul's:

> It did fail, for it never paid its way. It reached, if I remember right, a circulation of nearly 10,000--perhaps on one or two occasions may have gone beyond that. But the enterprise had been set on foot on a system too expensive to be made lucrative by anything short of a very large circulation. Literary merit will hardly set a magazine afloat, though when afloat it will sustain it. . . . Merit and time together may be effective, but they must be backed by economy and patience.[110]

Sadleir, however, has pointed out that in St. Paul's, Trollope tried, on the one hand, to reduce "work written from purely literary impulse to his own artificial conception of the capacities of a magazine public"

and, on the other, "to improve magazine-writing proper into at an imitation of literature." The result was mediocrity.[111] Trollope, of course, failed to realize this and instead asserted that "publishers themselves have been the best editors of magazines":

> The Cornhill . . . after Thackeray had left it and before Leslie Stephen had taken it, seemed to be in quite efficient hands,—those being the hands of proprietor and publisher.[112]

In the biography of Thackeray, this personal awareness of the problems of the editor led Trollope into a biased view of Thackeray's editorship:

> The magazine was a great success, but justice compels me to say that Thackeray was not a good editor. As he would have been an indifferent civil servant, an indifferent member of Parliament, so was he perfunctory as an editor. . . . I think it may be doubtful whether Thackeray did bring himself to read the basketsful of manuscripts with which he was deluged, but he probably did, sooner or later, read the touching little private notes by which they were accompanied. . . .[113]

With the editor of a magazine that had failed writing adverse criticism of the editor of a magazine that was one of the most successful magazines of the nineteenth century and accusing the latter of being a poor editor, a weird situation is set up. Trollope apparently had reasons for condemning Thackeray's editorship—he made a point of saying that he worked only for Smith and another point of saying that editors should be the publishers—and the main reason is his development of a picture of Thackeray originally through Yates's eyes. That this picture colored their early months of acquaintance will be apparent when we look at their relation in the spring of 1860; that it remained until 1879 is apparent in Trollope's double view of his great rival.

Notes

[1]Anne Thackeray Ritchie, "The First Number of 'The Cornhill,'" The Cornhill Magazine, n.s. I (July, 1896), 3. Also see Anne Thackeray Ritchie, "Biographical Introductions," The Biographical Edition of the Works of William Makepeace Thackeray (London, 1898-1899), XI, xviii.

[2]Robinson, British Post Office, p. 328.

[3]Bevington, p. 3.

[4]Robinson, British Post Office, p. 355.

[5]J. W. Robertson Scott, The Story of the Pall Mall Gazette, of its First Editor, Frederick Greenwood, and of its Founder, George Murray Smith (London, 1950), pp. 40-41.

[6]Ibid., p. 47.

[7][Leonard Huxley], The House of Smith, Elder (London, 1923), p. 89.

[8]See the bibliography in Lewis Melville, William Makepeace Thackeray: A Biography Including Hitherto Uncollected Letters and Speeches and A Bibliography of 1300 Items (London, 1910), II, 260-289.

[9]Robertson Scott, p. 63, and Elwin, pp. 344-345.

[10]Quoted from George Smith, A Memoir in Thackeray Letters, IV, 130, fn.10. It also appears with slight textual variations in Huxley, p. 94.

[11]Thackeray Letters, IV, 130.

[12]Yates was prevented from pressing charges at the last moment by the Club's legal maneuver to force the case into the Court of Chancery, the cost of which he "was not prepared to undertake . . . and the proposed action was eventually abandoned." Recollections and Experiences, II, 30-31.

[13]Letter to William Duer Robinson. Thackeray Letters, IV, 136.

[14]Peter Smith, "The Cornhill Magazine--Number 1," A Review of English Literature, IV (April, 1963), 24.

[15]Robertson Scott, p. 65.

[16]Thackeray Letters, IV, 155.

[17]Anne Thackeray Ritchie, "The First Editor: And the Founder," The Cornhill Magazine, n.s. XXVIII (January, 1910), 2.

[18]See Letter of January 23, 1860, from Thackeray to George Smith. Thackeray Letters, IV, 172.

[19]Autobiography, p. 138.

[20]Quoted in Robertson Scott, pp. 67-68.

[21]Letter to George Smith. Thackeray Letters, IV, 154.

[22]Letter of October 4 to George Smith. Ibid., p. 156.

[23]Ibid., p. 159.

[24]Gordon S. Haight (ed.), The George Eliot Letters (New Haven, 1954-1955), III, 210. Hereafter referred to as George Eliot Letters.

[25]Robertson Scott, p. 67.

[26]Letter of September 7 to George Smith. Thackeray Letters, IV, 150.

[27]Ritchie, "The First Number," p. 6.

[28]Letter of October 28. Thackeray Letters, IV, 158.

[29]Circular of November 1. Ibid., pp. 159-160.

[30]Ritchie, "The First Number," p. 5.

[31]See bibliography, Melville, II, 289. He finished no. 24 on September 7. Thackeray Letters, IV, 149.

[32]Thackeray Letters, IV, 148, fn.44.

[33]Ritchie, "Biographical Introductions," XI, xv.

[34]Reference to his poor health is made in the following letters: of May 15 to Mrs. Theresa Hatch (Thackeray Letters, IV, 140); of May 23 to Mrs. Blackwood (ibid., p. 142); of August 23 to his daughters (ibid., p. 148); of September ? - October 16 to Tennyson (ibid., p. 151); of October 1 to Mrs. Carmichael-Smyth (ibid., pp. 154-155); and of December 16 to Mrs. Irvine (ibid., p. 169).

[35]Ibid., pp. 143-144.

[36]Wisdom, p. 295.

[37]Ritchie, "The First Number," p. 6.

[38]George Eliot Letters, III, 195.

[39]Thackeray Letters, IV, 148-149.

[40]Herman Merivale and Frank T. Marzials, Life of W. M. Thackeray (London, 1891), P. 199.

[41]Autobiography, p. 108.

[42]Trollope Letters, pp. 47-48.

[43]Sadleir, p. 201.

[44]Autobiography, p. 119.

[45]Ibid., pp. 125-126.

[46]Autobiography, p. 111.

[47]Trollope Letters, p. 52.

[48]Autobiography, p. 112.

[49]Thackeray Letters, IV, 158-159. Also see Autobiography, p. 112, and Trollope Letters, p. 53.

[50]Autobiography, p. 113.

[51]Ibid., p. 115.

[52]Bradford A. Booth, Anthony Trollope: Aspects of his Life and Work (London, 1958), p. 105.

[53]Lucy and Richard Poate Stebbins, The Trollopes: The Chronicle of a Writing Family (New York, 1945), pp. 171-172.

[54]Autobiography, p. 113.

[55]Ibid., p. 115.

[56]Ibid., pp. 116-117.

[57]Ibid., p. 124.

[58]Sadleir, p. 407. He returned to Framley Parsonage on April 1, the day after Castle Richmond was finished, and completed it on June 30.

[59]Autobiography, pp. 98-99.

[60]Ibid., p. 207.

[61]Trollope Letters, p. 54.

[62]Wisdom, p. 295.

[63]Thackeray Letters, IV, 168.

[64]Trollope Letters, p. 54.

[65]Wisdom, p. 295.

[66]Thackeray Letters, IV, 169-170.

[67]Trollope Letters, p. 55.

[68]Ritchie, "The First Number," p. 2.

[69]Letter to George Smith. Thackeray Letters, IV, 162.

[70]Ritchie, "The First Number," p. 2.

[71]Anthony Trollope, Thackeray ("English Men of Letters"; London, 1879), p. 53. Hereafter referred to as Thackeray.

[72]This sentence is worded, "Mr. Reginald Smith reminds me," in Ritchie, "The First Number," p. 1.

[73]Ritchie, "Biographical Introductions," XI, xviii.

[74]Robertson Scott, p. 69.

[75]Wisdom, p. 296.

[76]Ritchie, "The First Number," p. 1.

[77]Ritchie, "The First Editor," p. 2.

[78]Wisdom, p. 296.

[79]Ritchie, "The First Editor," p. 2.

[80]Wisdom, p. 299.

[81]Ritchie, "The First Number," p. 7.

[82]Ibid., p. 12.

[83]Thackeray Letters, IV, 266-267.

[84]Ibid., p. 228.

[85]See Wisdom, p. 300.

[86]William Makepeace Thackeray, "Thorns in the Cushion," The Biographical Edition of the Works of William Makepeace Thackeray (London, 1898-1899), XII, 213-214. Hereafter referred to as Works.

[87]Ritchie, "The First Number," p. 10.

[88]Quoted in Robertson Scott, p. 76.

[89]Ritchie, "The First Number," p. 6.

[90]Robertson Scott, p. 79.

[91]A third novel, Denis Duval, left unfinished at his death, printed in March and June, 1864.

[92]See bibliography in Elwin, pp. 389-390.

[93]Thackeray Letters, IV, 225-226.

[94]Wisdom, p. 306.

[95]Ray apparently owns the letter of this date, a cover letter for Yates's contribution; if so, Yates's affirmation that he sent the poem "without remark" is a later confusion of facts intended to belittle Thackeray. See Recollections and Experiences, II, 58.

[96]Thackeray Letters, IV, 171.

[97]Ibid., p. 215, fn.2.

[98]Quoted from Henry William and Irene Law's The Book of Beresford Hopes in Bevington, p. 28.

[99]Wisdom, pp. 304-305.

[100]Thackeray, "Nil Nisi Bonum," Works, XII, 177.

[101]Thackeray, "De Juventute," Works, XII, 232.

[102]Thackeray, "Small Beer Chronicle," Works, XII, 303.

[103]Thackeray, "Thorns in the Cushion," Works, XII, 212.

[104]Wisdom, pp. 305-306.

[105]Autobiography, pp. 114-115.

[106] *Thackeray*, p. 52.

[107] Melville, p. 41.

[108] Hugh Walpole, *Anthony Trollope* ("English Men of Letters"; New York, 1928), p. 90.

[109] Sadleir, p. 279.

[110] *Autobiography*, p. 218.

[111] Sadleir, p. 297.

[112] *Autobiography*, pp. 218-219.

[113] *Thackeray*, p. 54.

CHAPTER III

1860--THE YEAR OF MISUNDERSTANDINGS

The year 1860 could justly be called the "year of misunderstandings" in the relation between Thackeray and Trollope; it was the year in which the two men met. To understand the early part of the year most clearly and without clouding our perspectives with prejudice or preconceived notions demands a suspension of judgment and a detachment from the figures involved. This has been difficult in the past and is, perhaps, humanly impossible. The three figures, Trollope, Thackeray, and Yates, play roles that, while difficult to untangle, need to be analyzed if we are to comprehend Trollope's volume in the English Men of Letters series. The conflicts and the misunderstandings arose from the social function of a series of dinners given by the publisher to the staff and contributors of the Cornhill. George Smith, acting in a tradition followed by Mark Lemon of Punch, probably like John Douglas Cook of the Saturday Review saw the dinners as a method "of encouraging a sense of unity."[1] But such a worthy goal was not the result of the first four dinners, because these tended to put a division between the editor and one of his major contributors, Anthony Trollope.

If we alter the chronological sequence of the first five months of 1860 by looking at the two major pieces of evidence concerning the Cornhill dinners, the proper sequence can be better understood.

In a widely quoted passage from his autobiography George Smith describes the first meeting of Trollope and Thackeray:

> We lightened our labours in the service of the Cornhill by monthly dinners. The principal contributors used to assemble at my table in Gloucester Square every month while we were in London; and these "Cornhill dinners" were very delightful and interesting. Thackeray always attended, though he was often in an indifferent state of health. At one of these dinners Trollope was to meet Thackeray for the first time and was equally looking forward to an introduction to him. Just before dinner I took him up to Thackeray and introduced him with all the suitable empressment. Thackeray curtly said, "How do?" and, to my wonder, and Trollope's anger, turned on his heel! He was suffering at the time from a malady which at that particular moment caused him a sudden spasm of pain; though we, of course, could not know this. I well remember the expression on Trollope's face at that moment, and no one who knew Trollope will doubt that he could look furious on an adequate--and sometimes on an inadequate--occasion! He came to me the next morning in a very wrathful mood, and said that had it not been that he was in my house for the first time, he would have walked out of it. He vowed he would never speak to Thackeray again, etc. etc. I did my best to soothe him; and, though rather violent and irritable, he had a fine nature with a substratum of great kindliness, and I believe he left my room in a happier frame of mind than when he entered it. He and Thackeray became after close friends.[2]

Smith makes four major points which will be of great importance: (1) Trollope first met Thackeray at a Cornhill dinner, the first that Trollope attended and the first time that Trollope was in Smith's home; (2) Thackeray, driven by a sudden pain, snubbed Trollope; (3) Trollope was subsequently infuriated; and (4) Smith asserts that after Trollope visited him the next morning, the friction was eased and the two writers became "close friends."

The second important passage is a paragraph that was suppressed from Trollope's autobiography; in this he describes his impressions of the first Cornhill dinner and its aftermath:

> I do not know whether I did not put an end to these dinners by an indiscretion of my own. It was I think at the first of them that Thackeray, sitting opposite to his host, asked whether Dr. Johnson was getting his dinner behind the scenes. The old story is too well known to require any further telling here. Our munificent publisher being engaged with his neighbor did not hear the question, and Thackeray, naturally anxious for his little joke, repeated it. Whereupon Mr. Smith, who was still very eager with the friend at his elbow, replied that he did not think there was anyone of the name of Johnson in the room. There was not much fun in it, but, what there was, consisted in Thackeray's vain attempt to have his allusion recognized. On the next morning, I unfortunately told the story to a friend;—but I told it also in the presence of a man to whom nothing could be told quite safely. He was, though I did not know it then, a literary gutter-scraper,—one who picked up odds and ends of scandal from chance sources, and turning them with a spin of malice into false records, made his money of them among such newspapers as would pay him. This story, although bedevilled and twisted from the truth—crammed with bitterness both against Thackeray and Smith, loaded with poison,—— was sent to an American newspaper. That alone would not have mattered much because American newspapers are not much read in this country. But The Saturday Review, which everybody reads, or which at least everybody then read, got hold by chance of the American paper and more suo, tore everybody concerned to pieces. Why were such dinners given? Why were such stories told? Was it endurable to anybody that the conversation of a private table in London should be made gossip to satisfy the evil cravings of New York readers? This article afflicted

> Thackeray much. It annoyed Smith greatly. I taxed the gutter-scraper with his offense, and he owned his sin, praying to be forgiven. I confessed my fault to the others;—for it was a fault to have told anything in the presence of such a man. I was pardoned, but there were no more Cornhill dinners.[3]

Trollope's account may be narrowed to four points: (1) he is describing the first Cornhill dinner; (2) Thackeray was in good spirits and joked with his host; (3) he tells that the next morning he described the events of the evening in the presence of a man who can be identified as Edmund Yates; and (4) when Yates betrayed this confidence, Trollope confessed his indiscretions and was forgiven.

When we compare these two accounts, certain discrepancies become apparent, but in order to pin-point these discrepancies, the most important similarity must be noted. Trollope met Thackeray at the first Cornhill dinner, an event that is confirmed in his autobiography:

> It was in January 1860 that Mr. George Smith—to whose enterprise we owe not only the Cornhill Magazine but the Pall Mall Gazette—gave a sumptuous dinner to his contributors. It was a memorable banquet in many ways, but chiefly so to me because on that occasion I first met many men who afterwards became my most intimate associates. It can rarely happen that one such occasion can be the first starting-point of so many friendships. It was at that table, and on that day, that I first saw Thackeray, Charles Taylor (Sir) . . . Robert Bell, G. H. Lewes, and John Everett Millais.[4]

Other than this, the two accounts vary; Trollope makes no mention of his anger at Thackeray's cut although he does put Thackeray in an unfavorable light by describing a weak attempt to joke. Because

Trollope could not have known that Thackeray's behavior was motivated by "a sudden spasm of pain," he could not have understood the reason for the "affront"; therefore, if Thackeray was in a genial mood later in the evening, the affront would hardly have been eased. That Trollope remained angry is clearly stated by Smith's description of Trollope's fury the next morning, but if Smith was able to calm him, he must have told the story of Thackeray's "vain attempt to have his allusion recognized" before going to Smith, Elder. Because Trollope could not have escaped a knowledge of Yates's animosity toward Thackeray, his relation of such a story while in a state of anger is hardly an indiscretion arising from his ignorance of proper social behavior.[5] He knew Yates and knew that another person who believed himself badly treated by Thackeray would sympathize with his hurt feelings.[6] Since people are apt to judge these figures from preconceived notions of social behavior or bias toward one of the men, it is important to remember that Trollope did not know Thackeray before this dinner and the cut that he received was to him without meaning other than as an act of snobbery, that Trollope could not have known Thackeray's reasons for what appeared to be a personal affront, and that Trollope, as a man whose pride had been deeply wounded, sought to ease the humiliation by seeking the sympathy of a man whom he knew was Thackeray's enemy. In this human problem no man was either without or with blame.

According to Smith, the two writers "became after close friends"; this assertion needs to be further analyzed. In the suppressed portion of the autobiography, Trollope related that Yates, who was in

the presence of the man to whom he told the story of Thackeray's vain joke, sent the story to an American newspaper after twisting it from the truth. The article appeared in The New York Times for May 26, 1860, in a column entitled "Echoes from the London Clubs." It is important to read the most pertinent parts of this article:

> In literary matters we are all alive, but the success of the Cornhill Magazine is already showing symptoms of being on the wane. That notable periodical went up like a rocket, and is beginning to come down like the stick; it is certain that its first number sold nearly a hundred thousand, and that its second reached seventy thousand, but ever since then it has been declining, and now I should think forty thousand was about the mark. With a less circulation it would not--could not pay, for it receives comparatively few advertisements, and its expenses are enormous. There have been already four tremendously heavy dinner parties given by SMITH (of SMITH & ELDER,) at his residence in Gloucester-terrace, at which all of the principal contributors have been present. THACKERAY is, of course, the great gun of these banquets, and comes out with the greatest geniality in his power, speaking of G. H. LEWES as "Mr. BEDE," (Mrs. L. is the author of Adam Bede,) and drawing each man out to the extent of his ability. But there is one very funny story which will bear repetition: SMITH, the proprietor of the Cornhill, and the host on these occasions, is a very good man of business, but totally unread; his business has been to sell books, not to read them, and he knows little else. On the first occasion of their dining there, THACKERAY remarked to those around him, "This is a splendid dinner, such an one as CAVE, the bookseller of St. John's Gate, gave to his principal writers when Dr. JOHNSON'S coat was so shabby that he ate his meal behind the screen;" then calling out to his host, who was at the other end of the table, THACKERAY said, "Mr. SMITH, I hope you've not got JOHNSON there behind that screen!" "Eh?" said

> the bibliopole, astonished; "behind the screen? JOHNSON? God bless my soul, my dear Mr. THACKERAY, there's no person of the name of JOHNSON here, nor any one behind the screen--what on earth do you mean?" A roar of laughter cut him short; poor Mr. SMITH had probably never heard of Dr. JOHNSON and his screen dinner. The principal contributors to the Cornhill are ANTONY TROLLOPE, who is writing 'Framley Parsonage' in its pages; GEORGE SALA, the biographer of HOGARTH: Big HIGGINS, MONCKTON MILNES, and OXENFORD, of the Times; G. H. LEWES, who is writing the 'Insect Life;' HOLLINGSHEAD, HANNAY, Mrs. GASKELL, Sir JOHN BURGOYNE, Sir J. BOWRING, Capt. ALLEN YOUNG, DASENT (second Editor of the Times;) and a host of smaller fry. The paper called "Little Scholars," in the current number, was written by THACKERAY'S eldest daughter--her first attempt at literary composition; it is pretty, but bears traces of being touched up by the paternal hand,--as THACKERAY himself once said to PETER CUNNINGHAM, who was proudly pointing to some anonymous article as his writing: "Ah! I thought I recognized your hoof in it!" With the exception of DICKENS and THACKERAY, perhaps, ANTONY TROLLOPE is making more money than any English novelist. He has a situation in the Post-Office, which brings him over eight hundred a year; he gets a thousand guineas for his "Framley Parsonage;" and in addition to this, had just completed and published a novel with CHAPMAN & HALL; besides all he is making by his reprints and new editions. Some of his literary friends want him to give up the Post-Office and devote all his time to novel-writing, but he wisely looks upon his official position as a source of certain income, and intends to stick to it.[7]

In this piece of newspaper gossip Yates makes several statements which are immediately important: (1) there have been four Cornhill dinners (e.g., January, February, March, and April); (2) Thackeray's futile attempt to joke is related; (3) Smith is made out to be ignorant of literature; (4) Thackeray is accused of touching up "Little Scholars";

and (5) Trollope is, in contrast to Thackeray, placed in a favorable light. These five points help us to understand the reality that is hidden beneath the account. In the first place, Thackeray's joke, which can be dated at the January dinner, was apparently futile not because Smith was ignorant but because Smith thought quickly enough to top it with a rapid repartee. In this respect Yates's account written within four months of the event is probably more accurate than Trollope's written several years later.[8] But although Yates says that "a roar of laughter cut him short," he twists the actual event by implying that the laughter was directed at the publisher; however, Trollope did not make Smith ignorant, only preoccupied, so that the misunderstanding of the joke seems to be on Trollope's part, not on Smith's. Trollope's version is careful to save Smith's intellectual character while making Thackeray repeat the joke in a vain attempt. If Yates learned of the joke on the day following the January dinner, as he did according to Trollope, it is strange that he did not put it to use until four months later; if Trollope spoke to Yates only after the first dinner as he claims, it is strange that Yates mentions the decline of the Cornhill's circulation and the possible touching up of Anne's "Little Scholars." We know that the Cornhill declined in circulation during the first few months, but not to the extent of Yates's assertion and not financially to the distress of the publisher; hence Yates is entirely unaware of the actual facts and is probably guessing. In the matter of "Little Scholars," however, his version appears to be based on a misconception of the actual facts that might have derived from a Cornhill dinner. Many years later, Lady Ritchie told George Smith,

> I had written several novels and a tragedy by the age of fifteen, but then my father forbade me to waste my time any more scribbling, and desired me to read other people's books.
>
> I never wrote any more except one short fairy tale, until one day my father said he had got a very nice subject for me, and that he thought I might now begin to write again. That was Little Scholars which he christened for me and of which he corrected the stops and the spelling, and which you published to my still pride and rapture.[9]

If Thackeray admitted at a Cornhill dinner his suggestion of the subject and his corrections (which were probably no more than he would have done to any other contribution), a person wishing to attack him could easily have twisted the facts by overstatement; since Lady Ritchie pointed out her father's help, Thackeray very likely made some mention of it at Smith's table. Because Trollope could not have heard this at the January dinner, he must have heard it in April after Anne's story had been accepted for the May issue. Trollope definitely tells that he spoke in the presence of Yates after the January dinner; however, this information must have been given to the younger journalist in April. Trollope, therefore, saw Yates a second time--four months after the first--and this second relation of events led Yates to write the article that was published on May 26. With the necessity of the second meeting being apparent, Trollope's relation to Thackeray becomes clearer. Trollope, as we have seen, was more aligned to Yates's side of the Garrick Club Affair; hence when Thackeray snubbed him, he could hardly have sympathized with the editor. Rather Trollope's first impression--an impression which was still strong in April--was negative; Thackeray appeared to him to be everything that Yates would have called him.

As Trollope pointed out in the suppressed portion of his autobiography, Yates's column in The New York Times came to the attention of the widely circulated Saturday Review. It will be remembered that the Saturday Review had castigated both Thackeray and Yates in 1858 during the Garrick Club Affair and took a decidedly antagonistic stand against Thackeray after the initial success of the Cornhill. The interest in "Echoes from the London Clubs," however, was also derived from the Saturday Review's ideal of gentlemanly conduct. Earlier in 1860 a reviewer had criticized the publishing of club secrets:

> If you cannot keep a feeble circulation from becoming utter stagnation and death in any other way, you must do it by publishing what nobody else will publish.

Later the same reviewer warned,

> . . . by all the rules of English public morality, a man who thinks it his duty publicly to cast a slur on another man's name, must stand the risk of being as publicly called to account for it, and having to make as public a reparation.[10]

On June 23, the Saturday Review seized upon Yates's article, enlarged upon it, and soundly beat the principal figures; the following two passages from the long article, "Newspaper Gossip," are especially pertinent:

> In America they print what in English towns is only said or whispered; and, as the gossip sells well and is well paid for, it is sure to be amply provided. English gossip is particularly acceptable, and the letters of the London correspondent are accordingly a great feature of a New York newspaper. When these

accounts of what is going on here come back to London, they have the oddest possible effect. It seems so strange, first, that any one should write them--secondly, that any one should print them without being ashamed--and, thirdly, that the information, with its curious travesties of names and facts, should be credulously swallowed. As an example, we may take a communication that appeared in the New York Times of the 26th of May, under the title of "Echoes from the London Clubs." It deals with English people in a strain of extraordinary frankness, but we must venture to reproduce some of its statements, because it is impossible otherwise to estimate what we should come to here if society and the higher portion of the press did not constantly keep newspaper gossip in decent bounds. . . .

The fact is that he has so much literary gossip to communicate that he cannot afford much space to art. Principally he writes about the Cornhill Magazine. He does not seem to agree with Mr. Thackeray's rose-coloured views of the success of that publication, and no reader of the New York Times is likely to believe that the author of Vanity Fair has had much cause to streak himself with the red paint that was, as he has told us, the proper accompaniment of his triumphant. "That notable periodical," we read, "went up like a rocket and came down like a stick." But particulars about the sale of the different numbers into which he enters are wearisome, and open to question, so he soon hurries to something a little more personal. "There have been four tremendously heavy dinner parties given by Smith at his residence in Gloucester-terrace." Most of us remember the circular in which Mr. Thackeray announced his Magazine, and spoke of the claret of different growths that figuratively adorned his editorial board. This was poetry; but the correspondent sees only prose, and gives the following unvarnished account of these editorial repasts:--"Thackeray is of course the great gun of these banquets, and comes out with the greatest geniality in his power, speaking of G. H. Lewes as Mr. Bede, and drawing out each man to the extent to his ability." A dinner, we fear, might well be tremendously heavy at which the greatest geniality of the great gun is shown by his calling Mr. Lewes "Mr. Bede." There then follows a story to the disadvantage of the host.

> [The full story of Thackeray's joke and Smith's reply is quoted here from Yates's column.] A list of the principal contributors to the despised Magazine is then given—Antony Trollope, George Sala, Big Higgins, Billy Russell, and so on; and then the mention of Mr. Trollope's name leads to an interesting calculation how much that gentleman makes by writing novels, and how much he has from other sources; and thus the Americans are kept up to the current of things, and know all about English literature that is important and interesting to know.[11]

This account carefully reviews Yates's column, presenting four major points: (1) the expressed purpose of the article is "to keep newspaper gossip in decent bounds"; (2) the reviewer implicitly castigates the policy of staff dinners; (3) "Little Scholars" is not mentioned; and (4) the reviewer, although criticizing certain newspapers for publishing slanderous rumors, puts Thackeray in a bad light by quoting such slander. Perhaps, the reviewer was adhering to his own concept of the gentleman by his silence concerning "Little Scholars," since an attack through a young girl's first literary attempt was, indeed, "ungentlemanly." Besides this silence, however, the Saturday Review's attack against those people and newspapers which spread personal gossip and against Thackeray himself is blatant.

With his confidence in Yates made public, Trollope began to see the enormity of his action—not only Thackeray for whom he had no love but Smith, whom he admired, was brutally attacked. He chose the best approach to ease out of the situation, a full confession to Smith:

> Shortly after the Saturday Review article article appeared Trollope walked into my room and said he had come to confess that he had given Yates the information on which his article was founded. He expressed the deepest

> regret, but said, "I told the story not against you, but against Thackeray, and his blunder in seeming to compare you with that rascal Curle." I am afraid I answered him rather angrily. Trollope, however, took it very meekly, and said: "I know I have done wrong, and you may say anything you like to me."[12]

Sometime in June following the appearance of the Saturday Review's attack, Thackeray wrote to Smith:

> I have been lying awake half the night about that paper in a sort of despair; but I think I have found a climax dignified and humourous enough at last, Heaven be praised, and that our friend won't sin again. . . .[13]

The question of Thackeray's awareness of the identity of the person or persons who attacked him in "Echoes from the London Clubs" remains unanswered. We know that Trollope confessed his part in the affair to Smith, but we do not know if he confessed to Thackeray. Even though Thackeray probably had a very good idea that the writer of the article was Yates, the person who had attended the dinners could have been any one of a number who might profit from Thackeray's discomfort. Thackeray, however, was urged to write the Roundabout Paper, "On Screens in Dining Rooms," by Mrs. Smith, who was particularly upset by Yates's portrayal of her husband; from this source Thackeray may well have learned of the identity of the staff member even if he did not learn it from Smith himself.

Thackeray's answer to the attack was not published until the August number of the Cornhill. Since copy went to the printers about two weeks before publication, "On Screens in Dining Rooms" must have

occupied his time in the early weeks of July, shortly after the attack in the Saturday Review. In this paper Thackeray presents a counter-attack:

> That a writer should be taken to task about his books is fair, and he must abide the praise or the censure. But that a publisher should be criticised for his dinners, and for the conversation which did not take place there,—is this tolerable press practice, legitimate joking, or honourable warfare?

He then proceeds to defend himself and the Cornhill by pulling the Saturday Review and The New York Times correspondent over the coals of his wit:

> And suppose, Mr. Saturday Reviewer—you censor morum, you who pique yourself (and justly and honourably in the main) upon your character of gentleman, as well as of writer—suppose, not that you yourself invent and indite absurd twaddle about gentlemen's private meetings and transactions, but pick this wretched garbage out of a New York sheet, and hold it up for your readers' amusement—don't you think, my friend, that you might have been better employed? Here, in my Saturday Review, and in an American paper subsequently sent to me, I light, astonished, on an account of the dinners of my friend and publisher, which are described as "tremendously heavy," of the conversation (which does not take place), and of the guests assembled at the table. I am informed that the proprietor of the Cornhill, and the host on these occasions, is "a very good man, but totally unread;" and that on my asking him whether Doctor Johnson was dining behind the screen, he said, "God bless my soul, my dear sir, there's no person by the name of Johnson here, nor any one behind the screen," and that a roar of laughter cut him short. I am informed by the same New York correspondent that I have touched up a contributor's article; that I once said to a literary gentleman, who was proudly pointing to an anonymous article as his writing, "Ah! I thought I recognized your hoof in it." I am told by the same authority that the Cornhill Magazine

> "shows symptoms of being on the wane," and having sold nearly a hundred thousand copies, he (the correspondent) "should think forty thousand was now about the mark." Then the graceful writer passes on to the dinners, at which it appears the Editor of the Magazine "is the great gun, and comes out with all the geniality in his power."
>
> Now suppose this charming intelligence is untrue? Suppose the publisher . . . is a gentleman to the full as well informed as those whom he invites to his table? . . . he would find that "poor Mr. Smith" had heard that recondite anecdote of Doctor Johnson behind the screen; and as for "the great gun of those banquets," with what geniality should not I "come out" if I had an amiable companion close by me, jotting down my conversation for the New York Times!

Finally, Thackeray concluded his counter-attack by concentrating on the correspondent himself:

> As dear Sam Johnson sits behind the screen, too proud to show his threadbare coat and patches among the more prosperous brethren of his trade, there is no want of dignity in him, in that homely image of labour ill-rewarded, genius as yet recognized, independence sturdy and uncomplaining. But Mr. Nameless, behind the screen uninvited, peering at the company, and the meal, catching up scraps of the jokes, and noting down the guests's behaviour and conversation—what a figure his is! Allons, Mr. Nameless! Put up your notebook; walk out of the hall; and leave gentlemen alone who would be private and wish you no harm.[14]

Here Thackeray makes several assertions: (1) the conversation did not take place, at least in the manner described; (2) the Saturday Review is as guilty as the New York Times for spreading slanderous rumors; (3) critics have the right to anatomize works, not personalities; and (4) the attacker is called "Mr. Nameless" and is made out to have eavesdropped because he was not invited. "Mr. Nameless," who has

been recognized as Edmund Yates, is actually both Yates and Trollope--and anyone who spreads gossip about his betters. But Trollope was not touched by the paper as he thought he would be: "The R. Paper is not so severe as I thought it would be--but it is better so."[15] If Thackeray did not know Trollope's part in the affair before copy was sent to the printers, the attack on writers and publishers of scandal was general enough to express a gentleman's disdain at the unwarranted behavior of his inferiors. If he did know of Trollope's part as Yates's informer, Thackeray's silence and generalization of his attack arose, perhaps, from a desire not to muddy his hands in the offensive practices employed by those whom he regarded as his inferiors. Whichever the case, Thackeray's treatment of the disagreeable episode silenced Yates and prevented further "indiscretions" by Trollope. That Thackeray might have learned of Trollope's part is implied in their official relation of contributor and editor during the latter part of 1860, but again it is more probable that Thackeray was innocent of knowledge of his contributor's guilt for some time and when he did learn of it was willing to forgive the offence. As far as Trollope is concerned, there were still moments of hard feelings to come, but we can assume that Yates's attack on Smith turned Trollope against the younger man just as the mannered reply of Thackeray began to win Trollope to his side. But Trollope's view of Thackeray continued, though in a lesser degree, to be colored by the initial impression that was fortified by Yates's enmity.

The events of the latter half of 1860 indicate that Smith's and, perhaps, Thackeray's forgiveness of Trollope's confessed indiscretion was slow in development, because Trollope found himself in the predicament of having articles rejected. Although he said in the autobiography that he never dealt directly with Thackeray, in the case of the second rejection, and the one that raised him to greatest anger, he was brought into a direct clash with the editor. That Thackeray knew of Trollope's part in the scandal of the immediately preceding months might well account for the rancor displayed on both sides at the rejection of "Mrs. General Talboys," but even if Thackeray was innocent of hard feelings, Trollope took the rejection so personally that his reaction reveals the deeply rooted antagonism that grew from the earliest opinion he held of Thackeray and that was cultivated by Thackeray's behavior at the first Cornhill dinner. When he described Thackeray in the English Men of Letters volume, Trollope mentioned this clash in order to further belittle his subject's ability as editor:

> I had once made an arrangement, not with Thackeray, but with the proprietors, as to some little story. The story was sent back to me by Thackeray—rejected. Virginibus puerisque! That was the gist of his objection. There was a project in a gentleman's mind,—as told in my story,—to run away with a married woman! Thackeray's letter was very kind, very regretful,—full of apology for such treatment to a contributor. But—Virginibus puerisque! I was quite sure that Thackeray had not taken the trouble to read the story himself. Some moral deputy had read it, and disapproving, no doubt properly, of the little project to which I have alluded, had incited the editor to use his authority.

> That Thackeray had suffered when he wrote it was easy to see, fearing that he was giving pain to one he would fain have pleased. I wrote him a long letter in return, as full of drollery as I knew how to make it. In four or five days there came a reply in the same spirit—boiling over with fun. He had kept my letter by him, not daring to open it,—as he says that he did with that eligible invitation. At last he had given it to one of his girls to examine,—to see whether the thorn would be too sharp, whether I had turned upon him with reproaches. A man so susceptible, so prone to work by fits and starts, so unmethodical, could not have been a good editor.[16]

To understand the full impact of this comment, and to see the way in which Trollope has twisted the event to result in this picture, we must begin in July, 1860 when Trollope submitted "The Banks of Jordon" to George Smith.

Trollope wrote "The Banks of Jordon" in about ten days and offered it to Smith with caution that sprang from a sense of inferiority, possibly more pronounced because of the recent discovery of his indiscretion:

> I have a story, written within the last ten days, about the Holy Land—I suppose it would not be wanted by you for the magazine. It would run 30 pages & have to be divided in two,—or three if you preferred. But, as I said, I do not presume it would be wanted, & therefore ask the question almost idly.
>
> The name is
>
> The Banks of Jordon.
>
> If you see it or hear of it elsewhere dont mention it as being mine. Not that I have any idea of publishing it immediately.[17]

When he actually submitted the story on August 1, Smith rejected it. When Trollope replied to Smith's objections on August 9, he defended himself against the standards of Victorian taste:

> There shall be no rap on the knuckles. I do nothing in that line unless I am purposely rubbed against the hair. But you city publishers are so uncommonly delicate, whereas anything passes at the West End! I shall never forget a terrible & killing correspondence which I had with W. Longman because I would make a clergyman kiss a lady whom he proposed to marry—He, the clergyman I mean; not he W Longman. But in that instance William Longman's church principles were perhaps in stake.[18]

This objection presents the ground upon which Trollope and Thackeray were to clash on "Mrs. General Talboys." The Victorian reading public, in this case, was aligned with Smith and Thackeray; when the two stories were published in the London Review, Laurence Oliphant complained to Trollope that the "low moral tone of the stories" offended the readers.[19] The situation, therefore, was a division between Trollope and the Victorian reading public; that Smith and Thackeray took sides with the prevailing taste was only natural since they saw the Cornhill as a family magazine. With their knowledge of and Trollope's ignorance of the current taste, we have the curious situation that in the biography Trollope casts aspersions on the very attributes that made Thackeray a successful editor—his ability to read the moral thermometer of his reading public.

The genesis of "Mrs. General Talboys" might have come from Smith himself in late October or early November, although in his letter of November 6, Trollope may be referring to an earlier letter, now lost, in which he had mentioned the story to Smith. Nevertheless, in this letter Trollope first proposes the story:

> The story shall be done, & shall be with you without fail by 11 am Tuesday 13th Instant--18 pages exact. I say 18 that you may be able to make sure, & thinking that that number may be most suitable--being the mean of 16 & 20--If 20 (twenty) will suit you better, & if you will say so by return, you shall have 20 exact--If I don't hear again from you it will be 18--
>
> It shall be among the most inward of my inward things--no one being privy to it but my wife--[20]

Obviously Trollope was fond of his idea for the story even before it was written and hoped to overcome the ill feelings caused by "The Banks of Jordon." When "Mrs. General Talboys" was written, Mrs. Trollope did not care for it, but Trollope submitted it with greater confidence than he had the earlier story:

> I have completed Mrs Talboys. My wife, criticising it, says that it is ill-natured. I would propose you should call it
>
> Mrs General Talboys.
>
> I hope and trust that there is not and never has been any real General of that name. If so, we must alter it. I shall always call it "Mrs Talboys at Rome"--but you will probably chose to sink the Rome, as you have an article in the same number about the eternal city.[21]

The story was set into page proofs by Smith before Thackeray vetoed it, which means that Smith sanctioned the story while the editor did not. Trollope must have learned of Thackeray's veto on either November 14 or 15, for on the 15th he wrote letters to both Smith and Thackeray. In the former he merely asked for the return of the manuscript; in the latter, the letter mentioned in Thackeray as being "as full of drollery as I knew how to make it," Trollope criticised certain of Thackeray's characters and the conception of the Cornhill held and fostered by its proprietor and its editor:

I trust you to believe me when I assure you that I feel no annoyance as against you at the rejection of my story. An impartial Editor must do his duty. Pure morals must be supplied, and the owner of the responsible name must be the judge of the purity. A writer for a periodical makes himself subject to this judgment by undertaking such work; and a man who allows himself to be irritated because judgment goes against himself is an ass. So much I say, that I may be set down by you as disgusted, or angry, or malevolent. But a few words I must say also in defence of my own name.

I will not allow that I am indecent, and profess that squeamishness—in so far as it is squeamishness and not delicacy—should be disregarded by a writer. I of course look back for examples to justify myself in alluding to a man with illegitimate children, and to the existence of a woman who is not as pure as she should be. I think first of Effie Deans. Then coming down to our second modern great gun—Observe how civil I am to you after the injury you have done me—I reflect upon the naughtinesses of Miss Beatrice, all the more naughty in that they are told only by hints;—and also of the very wicked woman at Tunbridge Wells who was so surprised because young Warrington did not "do as others use" with her—I forget whether it was her daughter, or her niece, or her protegee. Then there is that illegitimate brat in Jane Eyre with the whole story of her birth; and Hetty Sorrel with almost the whole story of how the child was gotten. I could think of no pure English novelist, pure up to the Cornhill standard, except Dickens, but then I remember Oliver Twist and blushed for what my mother and sisters read in that very fie-fie story. I have mentioned our five greatest names, & feel that I do not approach them in naughtiness any more than I do in genius.

But in such cases, you will say, the impurities rest on the heads of individual authors,—and that you must especially guard the Cornhill. But how have we stood there? History perhaps should be told even to the squeamish, and therefore the improprieties of the improper Georges must be endured. But how about the innuendoes as to the opera dancers which made the children of Terpsichore so mad thru the three Kingdoms?

> You speak of the squeamishness of "our people." Are you not magnanimous enough to feel that you write urbi et orbi;—for the best and wisest of English readers; and not mainly for the weakest?
>
> I of course look forward to bringing out my own story in a magazine of my own—It will be called "The Marble Arch," and I trust to confound you by the popularity of Mrs Talboys.
>
> Joking apart—I must declare that I disagree with your criticisms. But at the same time I assure you that I am quite satisfied that you have used your own judgment impartially & with thoroughly good intention.[22]

Trollope does not reveal the same biting criticism of Thackeray's unmethodical working habits here, but he does imply that the editor does not know what he is doing. As he related in the biography, Thackeray's reply was delayed, but not because he was afraid to open Trollope's letter:

> I am just out of bed after one of my attacks, w^h leave me very nervous and incapable of letter writing or almost reading for a day or two. So, as your letter came, and upon a delicate subject or two—I told one of the girls to read it.
>
> I give you her very words—I can't help it if they are not more respectful. She says after reading the letter. "He is an old dear and you should write him an affectionate letter."
>
> Then I had the courage to have your letter read. I am another, am I? I always said so.
>
> "The Marble Arch" is such a good name that I have a months mind to take it for my own story.[23]

While neither Trollope's letter nor Thackeray's reply is fully honest, the friction between the men is obvious. Differences of temperament, of social background, and of outlook were separating the men to such an extent that Trollope's opinion of Thackeray, which derived from his acquaintance with Yates, could hardly have been enhanced. On the contrary, this correspondence seems to have deepened the gulf between them, for on January 5, 1861, Trollope wrote to Smith:

> I have been very glad to get your letter. I should have been unhappy to feel myself severed from the most popular periodical of the day, & assure you that I will do the best I can for you with B. J. & R.[24]

It seems only reasonable to assume that Trollope's dismissal from the staff came as a result of the clashes between him and the editor; because Trollope did not appreciate Thackeray as a man, he had no intimacy with him as a person. But because he deeply admired Thackeray's art, especially in Esmond, he sought to preserve his place, which was also very lucrative, on the Cornhill staff. This admiration of the writer caused Trollope to appear to many of his contemporaries to be Thackeray's close friend (and he may even have fooled Thackeray into believing that he was a closer friend than he really was) while consistently his opinion of Thackeray reverted to that held by Yates.

Notes

[1]Bevington, p. 37.

[2]Huxley, p. 104.

[3]Wilfred Partington, "The Indiscretion of Anthony Trollope," Bookman, LXXVI (February, 1933), 207.

[4]Autobiography, p. 119.

[5]That Trollope was ignorant of social behavior is obvious from Sala's account of the first Cornhill dinner: "Anthony Trollope was very much to the fore, contradicting everybody; afterwards saying kind things to everybody, and occasionally going to sleep on sofas or chairs; or leaning against side-boards, and even somnolent while standing erect on the hearthrug. I never knew a man who could take so many spells of 'forty winks' at unexpected moments, and then turn up quite wakeful, alert, and pugnacious, as the author of 'Barchester Towers,' who had nothing of the bear but his skin, but whose ursine envelope was assuredly of the most grisly texture." George Augustus Sala, Things I Have Seen and People I Have Known (London, 1894), I, 30-31.

[6]Because of the earlier relation with Yates, Trollope's behavior seems to be more than "social ignorance," hence it is necessary to modify Mr. Sadleir's account of this episode. See Sadleir, p. 214.

[7][Edmund Yates], "Echoes from the London Clubs," The New York Times, IX (May 26, 1860), 2.

[8]It should be noted that George Smith's own account differs substantially from both Trollope and Yates: "Yates's account was obviously at second-hand, and was blunderingly inaccurate. The fact was that Thackeray, confusing one name with another, as he was apt to do, said, 'This reminds me of one of Mr. Curle's dinners'; and then went on to ask if Dr. Johnson was behind the screen. In Boswell's version, the dinner took place at Tonson's--a man of honour and standing; Curle, as every one knows, was an infamous book-seller of the Dr. Johnson period, notorious for every sort of villainy. Thackeray's blunder in substituting Curle's name for Tonson's aroused a laugh, partly at his expense and partly at mine; and I answered rather sharply, perhaps, 'There is no Dr. Johnson here.'" Quoted in Huxley, p. 105.

[9]Hester Thackeray Fuller and Violet Hammersley, Thackeray's Daughter: Some Recollections of Anne Thackeray Ritchie (London, 1952), pp. 87-88.

[10]"Club Secrets," The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, and Art, IX (March 24, 1860), 368.

[11]"Newspaper Gossip," The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, and Art, IX (June 23, 1860), 799-800.

[12]Huxley, pp. 105-106.

[13]Thackeray Letters, IV, 189-190.

[14]Thackeray, "On Screens in Dining-Rooms," Works, XII, 220-222.

[15]Trollope Letters, p. 64.

[16]Thackeray, pp. 55-56.

[17]Trollope Letters, p. 66.

[18]Ibid., pp. 66-67.

[19]Ibid., p. 80.

[20]Ibid., p. 74. Although Mr. Booth does "not find anything in the next few numbers that answers this description," the correspondence of his promise to have a story in Smith's hands by the 13th and his mailing of "Mrs. General Talboys" on the 10th indicates that he is here referring to the rejected story.

[21] Ibid., p. 114.

[22] Ibid., pp. 77-79.

[23] Ibid., pp. 79-80.

[24] Ibid., p. 84.

CHAPTER IV

TROLLOPE'S OPINION OF THACKERAY FROM 1861 UNTIL 1876

Despite the conflicts between the two men in 1860, the relation underwent a change to a calmer association in 1861, the year from which we may date a more sympathetic acquaintance between Trollope and Thackeray. Because Trollope's ill feelings were repressed during the last two and one half years before Thackeray's death, the relation between the two men gave the overt appearance witnessed by George Smith when he remarked that they "became after close friends." This shift in Trollope's view of Thackeray ultimately developed into the ambivalent portrayal of the English Men of Letters volume. As we have seen, Trollope broke whatever acquaintance he had with Yates after the journalist put him in an embarrassing situation by betraying his confidence. If the realization of June, 1860, was the beginning of a gradual shift in feelings, Thackeray's mannerly response to the unpleasant episode in August was just the catalyst to further the change of outlook. The matter of the rejected stories, while preventing the immediate shift of Trollope to Thackeray's camp, seems to reflect Thackeray's fairness since he was acting in his desire to better the quality of the magazine, not from a selfish desire to thwart Trollope. From Thackeray's viewpoint, then, Trollope's faux pas was to be met with understanding and to be forgiven. Thackeray, perhaps, went a

little out of his way to "save" Trollope from Yates and Dickens, for it remains difficult to see how a man of the world who idealized a concept of the middle class gentleman could truly befriend a man so unlike himself. Leslie Stephen, later Thackeray's son-in-law, has left his impressions of Anthony Trollope, and from his statement, which is doubtless similar to Thackeray's, Trollope's character could hardly fit a concept of gentility:

> Nobody ever met the adult Trollope in the flesh without receiving one impression. . . . In person, Trollope resembled the ideal beefeater; square and sturdy, and as downright as a box on the ear. The simple, masculine character revealed itself in every lineament and gesture. His talk was as hearty and boisterous as a gust of a north-easter--a Kingsley north-easter, that is; not blighting, but bracing and genial. The first time I met him was in a low room, where he was talking with a friend almost as square and sturdy as himself. It seemed as if the roof was in danger of being blown off by the vigour of the conversational blasts. And yet, if I remember rightly, they were not disputing, but simply competing in the utterance of a perfectly harmless sentiment in which they cordially agreed. A talker of feeble lungs might be unable to get his fair share in the discussion; but not because Trollope was intentionally overbearing, or even rough. His kindliness and cordially were as unmistakable as his sincerity; and if he happened to impinge upon his hearers' sore points, it was from clumsiness, not malignity. He was incapable of shyness or diffidence, and would go at any subject as gallantly as he rode at a stiff fence in the hunting-field. His audacity sprang not from conceit, but from a little over-confidence in the power of downright common-sense.[1]

Yet Thackeray overcame whatever natural repugnance he might have held and in the last years of his life treated Trollope as fairly as could be expected.

The force that finally brought Trollope and Thackeray together was probably Trollope's election to membership in the Garrick Club:

> In 1861 I became a member of the Garrick Club, with which institution I have since been much identified. I had belonged to it about two years, when, on Thackeray's death, I was invited to fill his place on the Committee, and I have been one of that august body ever since. Having up to that time lived very little among men, having known hitherto nothing of clubs, having even as a boy been banished from social gatherings, I enjoyed infinitely at first the gaiety of the Garrick.[2]

Trollope had made many friends in London since occupying Waltham House in December, 1859, and the ones that brought him into the Garrick were definitely of Thackeray's faction. By this time Trollope had completely broken whatever ties he had to Yates, or he would not have been elected to the club; as late as April, 1873, the well known actor Henry Irving was blackballed from membership on account of his friendship with Yates.[3] Whether or not Trollope was personally allied to Thackeray at this time, he was not overtly antagonistic since Thackeray had risen in the club to a position of prominence. Prior to Trollope's election the relation of the men was characterized by misunderstandings; afterward the two men were brought into a closer relation and grew to have greater understanding. Trollope's membership in the Garrick Club is, therefore, the concrete action that was to bring the two novelists into a friendship. Such is not unusual, for the misunderstandings of 1860 largely arose from feelings or actions that were misinterpreted by Trollope, partly because of his preconceived idea of Thackeray's

character. After the men were in a position to associate in the club, the formal subordination of contributor to editor merged into an equality of club members. On this basis, Trollope learned to penetrate the myth of Thackeray and to see the vibrant and sensitive actuality beneath, and Thackeray discovered that beneath the blatant and coarse exterior presented by Trollope was a man eager to be loved and to be popular with his associates. These two shifts in outlook could only have come if and when the novelists were in a proximity that allowed the one to see the other frequently and on a more personal basis.

That Trollope had moved from the Yates's camp before his election to membership in the Garrick in the spring of 1861 is, perhaps, one of his reasons for rejecting John Maxwell's offer of the editorship of Temple Bar in August, 1861:

> Mr. Maxwell has asked me to offer you £1000 a year for three or five years, with the ostensible editorship of Temple Bar, if you will undertake to supply a novel and fill the position that Mr. Sala now occupies.
>
> All the real work of editorship will be performed--as heretofore--by Mr. Edmund Yates, who would act with you as sub-editor.[4]

Temple Bar had been launched in December, 1860, as a rival to the Cornhill, and for its first editor Maxwell had drawn Sala from Thackeray's staff. Thackeray was friendly to Sala, and they "parted on the best of terms."[5] Immediately thereafter Yates was picked as the acting editor:

> My old friend George Sala had undertaken the editorship, and had expressed a wish, in which Mr. Maxwell concurred, that I should act as assistant or working editor.[6]

Sala lent his name, but Yates, the assistant or sub-editor, was the actual force behind the magazine. Trollope, of course, knew that to accept the editorship of Temple Bar would put him into direct association with a man who, though once a friend, had already betrayed and thus embarrassed him. Since he was now a member of the Garrick Club and for the first time in his life felt himself accepted by his associates,[7] Trollope refused Maxwell's generous offer. Maxwell could hardly have made the offer to Trollope without Yates's knowledge; therefore, Yates's active antagonism to Trollope, while probably originating from his jealously in 1860, reached its full growth when he stepped into the position refused by Trollope. Yates's actions during this time were, perhaps, justified in whatever thrusts he might make against Thackeray or his supporters, since in his eyes he was forced to suffer for committing an offense that Thackeray himself was guilty of.[8] On May 25, 1889, he defended his action to Herman Merivale, who was then collecting materials for his biography of Thackeray:

> Please bear in mind, first, the circumstances under which the offending little article was written. While the press waited, to supply 'short copy', at a desk in a printing office, with the master-printer at my elbow, urging me on, slip by slip being carried off to the compositors, as it was written. Think that I was then only 27 years old, with wife & three children, supplementing a small Post Office salary by journalistic labour, sitting down at my desk, three or four nights a week, after my day's official grind, sitting down at 8 pm. & steadily writing till midnight. Remember what the social degradation inflicted upon me at Thackeray's instance, not the fury of a moment but deliberately insisted on through six weeks,

> meant to an unknown man, who had not made any mark then, but was merely pulling the devil by the tail, in a struggle for bread. Think of being 'expelled' from a club, as tho' one had been a cardsharper, a cheat, a thief, a braggart about women![9]

Yet Yates failed to learn his lesson, for he was later sent to prison for libelling the Earl of Lonsdale from gossip picked up at the Carlton Club,[10] and Sala relates the following episode from late in Yates's life:

> I remember once, at a dinner at poor Edmund Yates's, his wife propounding to three of her male guests--her husband, Dion Boucicault, and myself--the grave question 'whether we were sorry'--you know what I mean; sorry in the 'all-round' sense, unreservedly penitent, as Catholics must declare themselves to be in a confession générale. Boucicault was the first called upon to speak. The bright-witted dramatist . . . replied, with truth beaming from his expressive countenance, that he was deeply, unfeignedly sorry for all his sins. Then came my turn. I replied diplomatically, that I was going to be sorry. Mieux tard que jamais. Then the dread query . . . was put to Edmund. He looked at us; he looked at the ladies; he looked into his plate, and then, bringing his closed hand heavily on the table-cloth, he said, sternly and decisively, 'No!'[11]

When dealing with such a person, Trollope was fully in the right to refuse whatever offer Maxwell would have made, but more importantly the refusal forced Trollope to move further toward Thackeray's side and further from Yates's. This movement is important to Trollope's development of a view of Thackeray, for he had begun on Yates's side and, as we shall see, was never able completely to overcome certain attitudes toward Thackeray that were learned before meeting him.

Even though Thackeray invited Trollope to dine at his home on May 5,[12] there remained some ill feeling on his part, though the meager evidence seems to imply that the antagonism was much less than earlier. On May 24, he wrote to Lucy Baxter:

> I think Trollope is much more popular with the Cornhill Magazine readers than I am: and doubt whether I am not going down hill considerably in public favor. It doesn't concern me very much. . . .[13]

At this time he was running The Adventures of Philip in the Cornhill and Trollope's Framley Parsonage had just finished serialization. Neither Lovel the Widower nor The Four Georges had favorably struck the public, and with Philip he hoped

> to fetch up the ground w[h] I have—not lost, I trust, but only barely kept. I sang purposely small; wishing to keep my strongest for a later day, and give Trollope the honors of Violono primo. Now I must go to work with a vengeance.[14]

But Philip probably ranks lowest in popularity among Thackeray's novels[15] while Framley Parsonage even won Browning's approval:

> . . . let me say, the looseness of idiom and mistakes in the properties of words are nothing extraordinary—not worse than—nor so bad as,—those in some of Trollope's books—The "West Indies" for instance, which exceeds in slovenliness any clever man's production within my experience: these slips let you alone, by the bye, in "Framley Parsonage," and begin to bother you again in the first number of "Orley Farm,"—whence I conclude that Thackeray will have "English spoken" where he rules the roast.[16]

Thackeray, therefore, had some reason for a professional jealousy, especially since he was the editor of the magazine that was boasting his rival's reputation at his own expense. Two months later on July 2, G. H. Lewes observed,

> The fact is, Thackeray is so soured by the want of success which his writing of late has had, that he is sardonic and bitter against all who are successful—even against his friend Trollope, I hear. . . .[17]

Thackeray may also be justified in such jealousy, because it must have appeared to him that he had cut his own throat by keeping Trollope on his staff and by not opposing his election for membership in the Garrick Club after Trollope was instrumental in placing him in an unfavorable position in the public eye. Nevertheless, even if he knew of Trollope's part, Thackeray was not one to hold personal grudges for extended lengths of time; in the autumn of 1861 he even sympathized with Edmund Yates—"So poor Yates has been having gastric fever."[18] This friction appears to be the last that disturbed the relation of the two authors, at least from Thackeray's side.

One area of thought that found Trollope and Thackeray in opposing camps was the British reaction to the American Civil War. While in the United States during 1861-1862, Trollope visited all the states which had not then seceded. Outspoken in whatever he believed, Trollope had no sympathy with the Southern cause:

> The Southern cause was bad. The South had provoked the quarrel because its political supremacy was checked by the election of Mr. Lincoln to the Presidency. It had to fight as a little man against a big man, and fought gallantly,—and a feeling based on a misconception as to American character that the Southerners are better gentlemen than their Northern brethren,—did create great sympathy here; but I believe that the country was too just to be led into political action by a spirit of romance, and I was warranted in that belief.[19]

On the other hand, Thackeray, whose gentlemanly ideal caused him to lean toward the Confederacy, was personally interested in the Southern cause because of close friends then living in South Carolina.[20] Trollope published his sentiment in North America in May, 1862, immediately after his return to England; Thackeray had already struck out in his Roundabout Paper "On Half a Loaf" in February. This disagreement would be slight if Trollope was not the type of man eager to have his own views expressed; with Trollope's being outspoken and Thackeray being emotionally concerned with the Southern cause, some friction may have existed. If so, the disagreement did not significantly enter into their relation, because in 1862 Thackeray had already made a step that was to ease the way to a closer intimacy between them.

That the intimacy did grow despite such differences was largely the result of Thackeray's resignation from the editorship of the Cornhill in March. While no significance can be placed on his resigning while Trollope was in America, it is interesting that neither Thackeray nor Smith seemed to consider him as a possible successor. Smith first offered the position to Robert Browning, who refused because he was not to receive the same pay as Thackeray.[21] On April 8, George Smith called on G. H. Lewes, who entered in his journal that the publisher

> spoke to me about the editorship of the Cornhill Magazine which Thackeray has resigned. I declined taking any responsible position, but agreed that if he would edit it responsibly, get a subeditor, and some other adviser of whom I approved, I would act as consulting editor. He is to think over the proposition.[22]

A month later, May 8, Lewes accepted the position:

> In the afternoon George Smith called with a final proposal about the 'Cornhill' which I accepted, namely, that I am to act as his chief literary Adviser in the selection of articles, and suggestion of subjects, he bringing them to me and I only taking such responsibility as is implied in my judgement. Salary £600 per annum. This is very handsome, as the work promises to be light, and not disagreeable. In the evening read some proofs he sent up, and one m.s.[23]

With this action Thackeray was no longer Trollope's superior on the magazine; instead one of Trollope's closest friends, a man of whom he wrote, "George Lewes . . . has . . . been and still is one of my dearest friends,"[24] became the second editor of the Cornhill. With this change the formal division that had severed the two novelists was removed, and the gradual growth of intimacy that reached from Trollope's election into the Garrick Club was allowed to follow the more natural development between equals.

The most important episode that occurred after the resignation of Thackeray from the editorship and before his death was the joint loan of several hundred pounds to William Webb Follet Synge in May, 1862. The most widely quoted source for this episode, however, has been colored by the writer in such a manner that the true incidents are obviously misrepresented. In Thackeray Trollope tells the story to illustrate Thackeray's benevolence:

> I heard once a story of woe from a man who was the dear friend of both of us. The gentleman wanted a large sum of money instantly,—something under two thousand pounds,—had no natural friends who could provide it, but must go utterly to the wall without it. Pondering

> over this sad condition of things just revealed to me, I met Thackeray between the two mounted heroes at the Horse Guards, and told him the story. "Do you mean to say that I am to find two thousand pounds?" he said, angrily, with some expletives. I explained that I had not even suggested the doing of anything,—only that we might discuss the matter. Then there came over his face a peculiar smile, and a wink in his eye, and he whispered his suggestion as though half ashamed of his meanness. "I'll go half," he said, "if anybody will do the rest." And he did go half, at a day or two's notice, though the gentleman was no more than simply a friend. I am glad to be able to add that the money was quickly repaid.[25]

While Trollope does not mention that he lent Synge the other half[26] (even though the implication is too strong to miss), he does make several statements that need to be scrutinized: (1) he insinuated that Synge first approached him for the amount; (2) the characterization of Thackeray is hardly laudatory; and (3) he asserted that Synge "was no more than simply a friend" of Thackeray's. If we analyze these statements, several discrepancies between Trollope's account and the actual episode become apparent. In 1846 Synge entered the Foreign Service and was attached to the British legation at Washington from 1851 to July 1, 1853.[27] Thackeray had known him prior to this since on February 24 he told Mrs. Baxter that "my English acquaintance Synge has married a charming young creature a great deal too good for him."[28] On March 1 he sent Mrs. Synge a note of apology for leaving Washington without seeing her and asked her to visit him when she was in London.[29] Then in the autumn and winter of 1853 Thackeray lent the Synges his home, 13 Young Street, while he was in Italy.[30] These happenings are nine years before Thackeray loaned him money; therefore, Synge appears to

have been more than "simply a friend." He was a rather close friend of long standing. In August, 1860, Synge even named his son, William Makepeace Thackeray Synge, and Thackeray stood as godfather. In the second place Trollope relates that Thackeray answered his proposal "angrily, with some expletives" and then "whispered his suggestion, as though half ashamed of his meanness." While the latter reaction was more characteristic of Thackeray, the former assertion has more the romantic quality of a Trollopian character than any direct reference to Thackeray's recorded behavior. Mr. Ray has pointed out Thackeray's eagerness to help those in financial distress by loaning them money or even taking them into his home.[31] It is remarkable that Thackeray's first reaction to such a proposal should be of anger, just as it is surprising that Trollope approached him to ask for a loan of money for a man whom Thackeray had known over a considerable length of time as a friend. Finally Trollope insinuates that Synge first approached him, then he asked Thackeray. Shortly after seeing Trollope, Thackeray sent the following note to Synge:

> My Dear Doubleyou Doubleyou,
> I have just met a Trojan of the name of Trollope in the street (your ingenious note of last night kept me awake all night, be hanged to you), and the upshot is that we will do what you want between us. My dear old Synge, come and talk to me on Friday before twelve.[32]

Thackeray says that he has <u>just</u> met Trollope, but the sentence in parenthesis implies that Synge had written beforehand to Thackeray. If Synge did write to Thackeray asking for the loan, a circumstance that logically follows from their friendship and Synge's awareness

of Thackeray's benevolence, it was Thackeray, who, unable to loan the full amount brought the matter to Trollope's attention, not as in the version told by Trollope. While Trollope's version heightens the romantic qualities of the story, giving Thackeray "character," it raises Trollope to a more prominent position, the result of a desire that was also apparent in his treatment of Thackeray as an editor. In his diary for 1862 Thackeray made the cryptic entry of May 11, "Trollope at Star & Garter." Since Trollope tells that Thackeray lent the money "at a day or two's notice," this entry probably refers to the meeting of the two men at which Thackeray asked Trollope to go halves on the loan, because the entry for May 13 reads, "At Bankers 4640. Paid Graham 1000£ Synge 600£," and the one for May 15 closes the settlement:

> Synge agrees to make 9 half yearly payments of 100£ each beginning from October 1 and a 10th payment of 112.10 to close the transaction.[33]

Trollope's final statement is also misleading; while he said that "the money was quickly repaid," he was worried about the payment of the debt shortly after Thackeray's death:

> Synge, who is now Consul at Honolulu, borrowed, before he went in May 1862, £900 from Thackeray and £900 from me. It was agreed that £100 should be paid off quarterly. The first quarter to Thackeray & the second to me,—& so on. We each received the first £100, but then there was a stop. Last year, in the spring, I think, Synge's father died, & there were some proceeds out of which Thackeray received £400 & I £400. It was then agreed that the remainder should be repaid by quarterly payments of £50 instead of £100.

> Whether Thackeray has had any such payment I cannot say. I have not. They were to be made by Messrs. Bedwell & Alslop the clerks of the F. O. who pay moneys for the consuls &c. They can tell you whether Thackeray has had any further instalment.[34]

These misrepresentations of the truth in Thackeray pose again the basic question of the volume: if the traditional view of Trollope's close friendship with Thackeray is accepted, why does he present Thackeray in such a manner? In the case of his criticism of Thackeray's abilities as an editor the impulse that lowered Thackeray, perhaps, stemmed from his own failure as an editor; in this case he is obviously placing himself in a better position. Since both cases are rooted in the writer's desire to excuse or to praise himself, the relation between the two men could not have been the close friendship that is often asserted to have existed; instead Trollope, while drawn to his more prominent rival's side, retained an antagonism that he had learned from Yates and which had been re-enforced during the early months of 1860.

During 1863, the last year of Thackeray's life, the two men apparently found the closest degree of friendship that they were to have. Thackeray entertained Mrs. Trollope on February 14,[35] and on May 10 had the Trollopes to a dinner.[36] Other than these two affairs, the only concrete evidence for a meeting of the two families was in December, about ten days before Thackeray's death on December 24.[37] Since Thackeray was in London all of 1863 except for two periods, ten days in each April and August, there was ample time for more informal

meetings, especially since both men belonged to the Garrick Club and worked on the Cornhill staff. The major disturbance in Thackeray's last year was The Athenaeum's savage attack on him through Anne's The Story of Elizabeth, a novel that had run in the Cornhill between September, 1862, and January, 1863, but Trollope was not involved in this dispute, which began on April 23 and grew into a major scandal by December when Thackeray was refused a position on the National Shakespeare Committee. If anything, Trollope leaned toward Thackeray during this dispute, or Thackeray, who was personally affected, would not have entertained him at 2 Palace Green in May. Even though Thackeray was under great attack from the Bohemians, he had taken the action in the spring to reconcile himself to Dickens; therefore, Dickens was on friendly terms with him when he died suddenly in December.[38]

The Christmas of 1863 was bleak to those who had been friends of Thackeray. G. H. Lewes' entered in his diary that Christmas was solemn, "In the morning I called on Owen Jones and Dallas, where I heard of Thackeray's sudden death."[39] Writing to Isabella Blagden, Robert Browning described the manner in which he learned of the death:

> We had a sad Christmas of it with poor Thackeray's death: on the Wednesday (23) I was to have met him at dinner---he had sent to say he was unwell, so his empty place was provocative of the usual talk and tattle---next day, 24. I was certain to meet him at dinner also, because the people promised a wonderful Christmas Tree for children, a flock of whom were invited---on arriving, I heard his name mentioned---"Not too unwell to come?" I asked---he was dead.[40]

Charles Lever, a closer friend, was touched even deeper:

> Poor Thackeray! I cannot say how I was shocked at his death. He wrote his "Irish Sketch-Book," which he dedicated to me, in my old house at Templeogue, and it is with a heavy heart I think of all our long evenings together,--mingling our plans for the future with many a jest and many a story.
>
> He was fortunate, however, to go down in the full blaze of his genius--as few do. The fate of most is to go on pouring water on the lees, that people at last suspect they never got honest liquor from the tap at all.[41]

Even Thackeray's archenemy, Edmund Yates, says that the news shocked and disturbed him:

> The news came to me in the afternoon, as I was calling upon a friend at the Reform Club, and gave me a certain shock, as for ever destroying the hope which I had entertained that the breach between me and the great writer might eventually have been healed. For many months any bitterness which I may have at one time entertained against him had died out, and when I treated of his loss in print I was able conscientiously to claim my share of the great and general grief.[42]

Forster relates that the death was a "painful shock to Dickens,"[43] especially since the rival novelists had only recently been reconciled. Trollope's immediate reaction was similar, but touched with a greater sentimentality. On Christmas Day he expressed his sentiment in the moving lines to Edward Chapman:

> I have been greatly cut up by Thackerays death, which I only learned in the Times. It has not been a merry Christmas with us. I loved him dearly.[44]

That Trollope learned of Thackeray's death in the newspapers rather than from mutual friends is interesting, but understandable since Waltham

House was twelve miles from the city. In a letter to Follett Synge, written later in December, Trollope explains that he had not seen Thackeray for ten days prior to his death:

> I saw him for the last time about ten days before his death, and sat with him for half an hour talking about himself. I never knew him pleasanter or more at ease as to his bodily ailments. How I seem to have loved that dear head of his now that he has gone.
>
> I had better tell the story all through. It is bad to have to write it, but you will expect to be told. He had suffered very much on the Wednesday (23rd), but had got out in the afternoon. He was home early, and was so ill when going to bed that his servant suggested he had better stay. He was suffering from spasms and retching, having been for some months free from this complaint than for a long time previously. He would not have the servant, and was supposed to go to bed. He was heard moving in the night. . . . It is believed that he must have gone off between two and three, and I hear his last hours were painful. His arms and face were very rigid--as I was told by Leech who saw him in the morning afterwards.[45]

One sentence in this tense account stands dramatically in relief after having traced the relation of the men: "How I seem to have loved that dear head of his now that he has gone." The immediacy of such sentiment is particularly meaningful when we remember the frictions between them when they first met and the gradual lessening of their misunderstandings. But the sentence is interesting from another vantage: Trollope was increasingly aware of Thackeray's merits after Thackeray the man had been removed by death.

On December 25, Trollope wrote a brief, but from subsequent events a very important, letter to George Smith:

> You will of course insert in the next Cornhill some short notice of him. Who will do it for you? If you have no one better, I will do it gladly. Lewes, or Bell, or Russell would do it better. I only make the offer in the event of your having no one better—

He added a single sentence as a postscript: "Of course you will know that what I offer is a work of love."[46] Smith accepted his proposal, but because the copy for the January, 1864, number was already at the printers, the February number was the memorial issue. Trollope submitted his article before January 17, and on that date vetoed a more elaborate plan proposed by Smith:

> I received together at Norwich on Friday your letters of the 13—& 14!! In the former you propose to insert my paper with papers & verse from Dickens & Lord Houghton, and in the latter you suggest a longer memoir for the March number.
>
> I prefer the former plan. I do not feel up to writing a memoir, and I do not personally know enough, and tho' I might possibly borrow all that can be said from Hannays excellent article I do not care to borrow in that way. More of criticism that [?than] what I have attempted would I think be almost out of place. I have said nothing that I do not think and believe, but if I were to say more I should perhaps run into rhodomontade or else cool down into ordinary eulogy.[47]

Evidently neither Smith nor Trollope knew at this time that Thackeray had ordered his daughter, "When I drop there is to be no life written of me; mind this and consider it as my last testament and desire,"[48] because the "longer memoir" was obviously against Thackeray's wishes. In fact, even James Hannay's brief tribute was not appreciated by the Thackeray family, although Hannay had long been acquainted with his

subject. Yet Trollope's refusal of Smith's plans is founded on other considerations: he does "not feel up to writing a memoir" and does "not personally know enough." While the former excuse cannot be measured in terms of possible implications, the latter is certainly strange coming from a man who has been called Thackeray's close friend and who would sixteen years later write a biography of him. That he would need to rely on Hannay for information implies that he knew little of Thackeray's life before the time of their meeting: in other words, the friendship had not reached a point of intimacy in which Thackeray had trusted Trollope with his feelings or opinions that touched upon matters of personal interest. Trollope had been no friend of Thackeray as Forster had been of Dickens or as Lockhart of Scott. Perhaps, Thackeray, having been so frequently attacked in the last years of his life, was unable to trust Trollope, particularly since Trollope had already exposed him once before; perhaps, Trollope had never tried to place himself in a position to be intimately trusted. Regardless of the possibilities, the confession that he did not know Thackeray enough as a man is basic to the opinion he held of his rival as early as the article in the February, 1864, number of the Cornhill.

The most striking aspect of Trollope's eulogy is the prevailing sentimental tone introduced in the first paragraph:

> Now, at the present, it is not so much that he who has left us was known, admired, and valued, as that he was loved. The fine grey head, the dear face with its gentle smile, the sweet, manly voice which we knew so well, with its few words of kindest greeting: the gait, and manner, and personal presence of him whom it so delighted

> us to encounter in our casual comings and goings about the town—it is of these things, and of these things lost for ever, that we are now thinking! We think of them as of treasures which are not only lost, but which can never be replaced. He who knew Thackeray will have a vacancy in his heart's inmost casket, which must remain vacant till he dies. One loved him almost as one loves a woman, tenderly and with thoughtfulness,—thinking of him when away from him as a source of joy which cannot be analysed, but is full of comfort. One who loved him, loved him thus because his heart was tender, as is the heart of a woman.[49]

This tone reaches a climax in the final paragraph in which Trollope describes the funeral, "a very large gathering—between 1000 and 1500 people,"[50] that had been held on December 31 at Kensal Green:

> We saw him laid low in his simple grave at the close of last year, and we saw the brethren of his art, one after another, stand up on the stone at the grave foot to take a last look upon the coffin which held him. It was very sad. There were there the faces of rough men red with tears, who are not used to the melting mood. The grave was very simple, as became the sadness of the moment. At such times it is better that the very act of interment should be without pomp or sign of glory. But as weeks pass by us, they, who love English literature, will desire to see some preparation for placing a memento of him in that shrine in which we keep the monuments of our great men. It is to be regarded as a thing of course, that there should be a bust of Thackeray in Westminster Abbey.[51]

The article, however, reveals Trollope's submerged adverse criticism which, in this case, he used to heighten the image of Thackeray that he is projecting; the bulk of the comments, for example, is concerned with Thackeray's relation to the Cornhill.[52] After introducing this subject, Trollope says,

> It is not for any of us who were connected with him in the enterprise to say whether this [the Cornhill] was done successfully or not; but it is for us--for all men--to declare that he was the kindest of guides, the gentlest of rulers, and, as a fellow-workman, liberal, unselfish, considerate, beyond compare.[53]

But he quickly adds his judgment that Thackeray was a poor editor:

> There are many who delight in wielding the editorial ferule, good men and true, no doubt, who open their hearts genially to genius when they find it; but they can repress and crush the incapable tyro, or the would-be poetess who has nothing to support her own ambition, if not delight, at least with satisfaction. Of such men are good editors made. Whether it be a point against a man, or for him to be without such power, they who think of the subject may judge for themselves. Thackeray had it not. He lacked hardness for the place, and therefore, at the end of two years, he relinquished it.[54]

While this adverse criticism is intended to form the background against which the positive qualities of Thackeray's tenderness and kindliness may be contrasted for emphasis, the presence of this criticism is only one step removed from the view of Thackeray's editorship presented in the passage of the autobiography and the English Men of Letters volume that we have already noticed. The difference lies merely in the omission of the positive qualities in the later works; with mention of Thackeray's tenderness removed from the eulogy, the now submerged adverse criticism predominates. In contrast to this approach, Trollope's brief literary criticism is entirely laudatory, and in the two major points is identical to the view that he expressed sixteen years later. He regards "Esmond as the first and finest novel in the English language," and later he adds, "But if Esmond be, as a whole, our best English novel,

Colonel Newcome is the finest single character in English fiction."[55] If Trollope's desire to heighten the memory of the recently deceased Thackeray causes him to submerge adverse criticism and to praise without qualification Thackeray's artistic abilities, he reveals his split view of his subject as early as January, 1864. Writing immediately after the death of Thackeray, Trollope did not have time for his initial emotional reaction to cool; therefore, the adverse criticism must have been a strongly latent opinion that slowly emerged as the emotional association faded. Trollope himself may have realized his own inability clearly to present a fair image of Thackeray when he told Smith that "I do not feel up to writing a memoir." In the memorial article, however, he does not attempt a memoir, he merely mentions James Hannay's account then adds,

> The writing of his life will be a task, and we trust a work of love, for which there will probably be more than one candidate. We trust that it may fall into fitting hands,—into the hands of one who shall have loved wisely, and not too well,—but, above all things, into the hands of a true critic. That which the world will most want to know of Thackeray, is the effect which his writings have produced; we believe that effect to have been very wide, and beneficial withal. Let us hope, also, that the task of his biography may escape that untoward hurry which has ruined the interest of so many of the memoirs of our latter-day worthies.[56]

That the biographer should be "one who shall have loved wisely, and not too well," perhaps, reveals Trollope's primary qualification for the English Men of Letters volume; moreover, Trollope's emphasis here on "the effect which his writings have produced" explains the later volume in which Thackeray the artist is highly praised and discussed at length

while Thackeray the man is adversely criticised. This sentiment is most strikingly evident in two incidents that followed the writing of the article. In the first, Trollope wrote to Smith on February 10 asking payment for it, the demanded payment being the one volume edition of Esmond (1858),[57] and, in the second, Trollope's letter of thanks after Smith sent him the Laurence portrait of Thackeray reveals greater concern for the artist than for the man:

> This morning we hung Thackeray up in our library, and we are very much obliged to you for the present,—not only in that it is in itself so valuable, but more especially because it is one so suited to our feelings. . . . The next thing will be to have a perfect edition of his works—for which we must look to you.[58]

In both cases, it is Thackeray the artist who is praised.

Preceding Trollope's memorial article in the Cornhill was one by Charles Dickens; this article provides a helpful contrast to Trollope's. It must be remembered that Dickens and Thackeray were estranged during the Garrick Club Affair of 1858 and were only reconciled during the summer preceding Thackeray's death; the split had been deep, and both men ran high feelings against his rival. Yet Dickens tactfully and with great taste only mentions the differences, never alluding to the true proportions.[59] In fact, Dickens had not wanted to write the article in the first place: "At the solicitation of Mr. Smith and some of his friends, I have done what I would most gladly have excused myself from doing—if I felt I could—written a couple of pages about him in what was his own magazine."[60] Dickens's motivation, therefore, was not

founded in an emotional state of association with Thackeray; it was more soundly reasoned and written than Trollope's. The general tone, then is more objective; his description of the funeral, for example, is brief and to the point:

> On the bright wintry day, the last but one of the old year, he was laid in his grave at Kensal Green, there to mingle the dust to which the mortal part of him had returned, with that of a third child, lost in her infancy, years ago. The heads of a great concourse of his fellow-workers in the Arts, were bowed around his tomb.[61]

With a difference in tone comes a total difference in conception; while Trollope discusses Thackeray's works, Dickens wrote:

> In no pages should I take it upon myself at this time to discourse of his books, of his refined knowledge of character, of his subtle acquaintance with the weaknesses of human nature, of his delightful playfulness as an essayists, of his quaint and touching ballads, of his mastery over the English language. Least of all, in these pages, enriched by his brilliant qualities from the first of the series, and beforehand accepted by the Public through the strength of his great name.[62]

In contrast to Trollope, Dickens, who had known Thackeray some twenty-eight years, gathers anecdotes that he can remember to describe Thackeray the man, focusing upon minutiae that reveal the humor, gentleness, or vivacity of the man as Dickens remembered him. Trollope, plunging his account into the sentimental, had lost the actual man, but Dickens in his straightforward account emphasizes the Thackeray he had known so well and fought so violently. Perhaps, the estrangement was a factor in giving Dickens's account its deep poignancy, for instead of constructing elaborate rhetorical sentences when mentioning the qualities that come to his mind, he simply writes:

> These are slight remembrances; but it is to little familiar things suggestive of the voice, look, manner, never, never more to be encountered on this earth, that the mind first turns in a bereavement. And greater things that are known of him, in the way of his warm affections, his quiet endurance, his unselfish thoughtfulness for others, and his munificent hand, may not be told.[63]

To Dickens, Thackeray never "carried his heart-strings in a crystal case."[64] Dickens reluctance to discuss Thackeray's achievement was just since critics were fond of linking their names; his illumination of Thackeray's character is poignant because of the long and bitter estrangement; but his simple, more objective style gives the appearance of being written by a man who was not only more familiar with but even more closely associated with Thackeray than do the ornate rhetorical cadences of Trollope's account. It is as if one were to compare Everett's and Lincoln's speeches on the battlefield of Gettysburg.

Between the first sketch of Thackeray in February, 1864, and the second, the opinion presented in An Autobiography written between October, 1875, and April 30, 1876, Trollope underwent significant changes in his popularity, his experience, and above all in his opinion of Thackeray. As long as Thackeray lived, Trollope remained in his shadow, but when the more prominent was removed, Trollope catapulted into fame. He filled Thackeray's vacant seat on the Committee of the Garrick Club,[65] a position that placed him among the controllers and the powerful in-group of that small society. Later in the year he was elected to the Athenaeum Club to fill the seat vacated by Thackeray's

death.[66] He did not succeed Thackeray, however, as one of Smith, Elder's leading novelists, though he did publish five novels through Thackeray's old firm: to the end he was faithful to Chapman & Hall through whom he published a total of thirty-two books between 1858 and 1882. He did, nevertheless, rise to prominence as one of England's most prolific and, for the period between 1864 and 1870, most popular novelists. That he could have enjoyed such prosperity while Thackeray lived is dubious, but the prosperity he did enjoy after Thackeray's death was initially rooted in Thackeray and Smith's choice of him as the leading contributor to the first number of the Cornhill and the positions left open for him at Thackeray's death. Trollope may well have seen that he rose by following Thackeray's footsteps, because in the Thackeray there is much self-identification of the writer with his subject. On the other hand, Trollope might easily have resented being known as a disciple of Thackeray and have sought to break this conception; if this assumption is accurate, Trollope's opinion of Thackeray can again be compared to his opinion of Sir Rowland Hill, another man who had enabled him to rise but with whom he differed in opinion.

Even if Trollope was antagonistic to Sir Rowland, he remained in the Post Office until Sir Rowland retired. At this time a complex of causes drove him to a violent resignation. Edmund Yates accounts for the resignation of the man he had come to detest:

> . . . he was, if not in the first, first in the second, flight of novelists of the day; he was--what he had never been in his office--popular in certain circles, notably at the Garrick Club. He would have more leisure for

> clubs, hunting, and whist, and at the same time be earning more money; and he would have opportunities for foreign and colonial travel, and consequent book-making, such as he never would have had again in the department, where his official trips had already been much discussed.[67]

While the final phrase of Yates's account apparently points to some tension between Trollope and his superiors (even though many of his trips had been on official postal work), Yates learned the reasons for the retirement from Trollope's own version published posthumously the same year as Recollections and Experiences. In An Autobiography Trollope makes the resignation the result of long deliberation:

> In 1867 I made up my mind to take a step in life which was not unattended with peril, which many would call rash, and which, when taken, I should be sure at some period to regret. This step was the resignation of my place in the Post Office. I have described how it was that I contrived to combine the performances of its duties with my other avocations in life. I got up always very early; but even this did not suffice. I worked always on Sundays,—as to which no scruple of religion made me unhappy,—and not infrequently I was driven to work at night. In the winter when hunting was going on, I had to keep myself very much on the alert. And during the London season, when I was generally two or three days of the week in town, I found the official work to be a burden. I had determined some years previously, after due consideration with my wife, to abandon the Post Office when I had put by an income equal to the pension to which I should be entitled if I remained in the department till I was sixty. That I had now done, and I sighed for liberty.[68]

Trollope's resignation was accepted by his brother-in-law John Tilley, now Secretary of the Post Office,[69] and this man may have known that these reasons were only part of Trollope's excuse for retirement. Actually Trollope's resignation was the result of his being slighted.

In the autobiography he tells that he resigned when Mr. Scudamore was promoted over his head for a position, Assistant Secretary, for which he himself had applied. According to Sadleir, Edmund Yates became Scudamore's confidential aide in 1867; therefore, when Scudamore was advanced over Trollope, the novelist thought that he was the victim of Yates's intrigue.[70] The final encounter of the two men, however, did not separate their paths; as late as 1878, a year before Thackeray was written, both men, in a party of nine, attended a dinner given by T. H. S. Escott.[71] If Trollope did break with Post Office on account of Yates as has been postulated, it is interesting that Trollope became a friend of Alfred Austin, whose publication of personal gossip infuriated Robert Browning and who had doctored Yates during his sickness in Switzerland. Trollope became intimate enough with Austin during the 1870's that they were regular correspondents, and as early as May 5, 1871, Austin was allowed a glance at a side of Trollope frequently ignored, for on that date Trollope wrote to him, "We are in all misery of living among friends and pot-houses, going through that very worst phases of life which consists in a continuous and ever-failing attempt to be jolly with nothing to do."[72] While one treads on dangerous ground when assessing the relation between two men by their friendship with a third party, the relation between Yates and Trollope seems to be less sharply antagonistic when the friendship of each with the then rather disreputable Alfred Austin is brought into view. While two men may remain in animosity while both befriend a third man, the third man becomes the path by which the other two come to share common ideas and opinions.

Yates might well have written the 1858 article in the indiscretion of youth, but the article obviously reflects the jealousy of the less successful journalist. Trollope was more successful that Yates even in October, 1859, but to a man with a slight inferiority complex the more successful Thackeray was an object of jealousy. When Thackeray died and Trollope ascended to his prominence, the cause for jealousy remained; hence Trollope eulogized him in sentimental and rhetorical artificiality. When he took the seats of authority vacated by Thackeray, the jealousy could only have been kept alive by external forces that played upon him. One of these forces was the indirect influence of Edmund Yates coming to him by means of Alfred Austin. Thus Trollope's retirement was not motivated merely by Scudamore's advancement over his head, but by the deeply rooted feeling that he was in some way inferior, the same feeling that compelled him to almost superhuman production, and that the advancement was an act officially recognizing his own inability to cope with the work. Because he went immediately into the editorship of St. Paul's and soon again was revealed as a failure, Trollope by 1870 had lost, to some degree, faith in his own abilities and did not again match the peak he had earlier reached. The presence of Yates in these complex situations is no more surprising than Trollope's friendship with another "gutter scraper," for he seems in his own thought to have descended to the level that he had been on in 1858. With this misconception in mind we can understand his removal from Waltham House in April, 1871; his absences from England from May 24, 1871-December 20, 1872, from February 28-October,

1875, and from June 29, 1877-January 2, 1878; and his self-evaluation in An Autobiography, written immediately after the second trip. During this time (1870-1878), he seems to be searching within himself to discover that which had made him soar before his public and which he had lost before the plunges of 1867 and 1870. All this self-examination reaches a climax in his autobiography, the central book for any study of Trollope's biography.

On April 30, 1876, Trollope, having finished his autobiography, wrote his son,

> I wish you to accept as a gift from me, given you now, the accompanying pages which contain a memoir of my life. My intention is that they shall be published after my death, and be edited by you. . . . The publication, if made at all, should be effected as soon as possible after my death.[73]

The book was published in 1883, about nine months after the death of its author, so Henry Trollope adhered to the wishes of his father. Since the book would not appear during his life, Anthony Trollope wrote, we may assume, as honestly as he could, taking into consideration his knowledge that it would eventually be presented to the public. Therefore, the view of Thackeray that is present in the work is probably founded more closely on Trollope's personal opinion than either the eulogy or the English Men of Letters volume, and this view must be appreciated before we can comprehend the full implications of the 1879 volume. Before focusing upon this view, a few related items are important. At the time of writing, Trollope claims to be on friendly terms with John Forster and Wilkie Collins. While pointing out that

Forster "was not without his faults," Trollope added that after meeting him in 1848 Forster "has since been an intimate and valued friend" and that Forster was a good editor because he "would always bray in a literary mortar all critics who disagreed with [him], as though such disagreement were a personal offence requiring personal castigation."[74] He later refers to Wilkie Collins as "my friend"[75] and says of him:

> Of Wilkie Collins it is impossible for a true critic not to speak with admiration, because he has excelled all his contemporaries in a certain most difficult branch of his art. . . .[76]

Since Forster, the biographer of Dickens, and Collins, one of Dickens's intimate friends (though hostile to Forster), were both hostile to Thackeray, Trollope's affirmation of friendship, as in his earlier relation to Yates, placed him in the group personally opposed to Thackeray. This is significant for it further helps to account for the picture of Thackeray that was to be created just three years later. This alliance with people who personally disliked Thackeray, perhaps, explains the strange omission of Thackeray's name from an important sentence in the autobiography: "In our own century what literary names stand higher than those of Byron, Tennyson, Scott, Dickens, Macaulay, and Carlyle?"[77] Yet while Thackeray's name is omitted, Trollope later says that Dickens is inferior because his style "is jerky, ungrammatical, and created by himself in defiance of rules—almost as completely as that created by Carlyle."[78] Although a case cannot be built for Trollope's opinion of Thackeray deriving from the followers of Dickens, these references strongly imply that, at least in part, Trollope's

opinion may have been colored by that of persons whom he knew as friends but whom Thackeray had known as enemies.

We have already had occasion to analyze Trollope's opinion of Thackeray as an editor and Trollope's misleading accusation that the reason Framley Parsonage was given prominence in the first number of the Cornhill was due to Thackeray's idleness. At that time Trollope's reluctance to print a part of a novel before the whole was complete was mentioned; this principle, however, presents a sharp criticism of Trollope's contemporary novelists, including Thackeray:

> I knew, from what I read from month to month, that this hurried publication of incompleted work was frequently, I might perhaps say always, adopted by the leading novelists of the day. That such has been the case, is proved by the fact that Dickens, Thackeray, and Mrs. Gaskell died with unfinished novels, of which portions had been already published. . . . I was aware that an artist should keep in his hand the power of fitting the beginning of of his work to the end. No doubt it is his first duty to fit the end to the beginning, and he will endeavour to do so. But he should still keep in his hands the power of remedying any defect in this respect.[79]

The implication here is that the work so published is inferior to work that is completed prior to the publication of any part; if this remark were leveled directly at Thackeray, Trollope is implying that every major novel by him is of inferior quality, except Henry Esmond, the only novel first published when in a finished form and the novel that Trollope consistently picks as Thackeray's best. At its broadest, this judgment is extremely narrow and is not significantly contradicted by the more extended discussion of Thackeray's artistic achievements. This section opens with an unqualified praise of Thackeray's literary rank:

> I do not hesitate to name Thackeray the first. His knowledge of human nature was supreme, and his characters stand out as human beings, with a force and a truth which has not, I think, been within the reach of any other English novelist in any period.[80]

Trollope then concentrates on Thackeray's ability to draw well-rounded characters, but soon he inserts a qualification into his praise:

> Among all our novelists his style is the purest, as to my ear it is also the most harmonious. Sometimes it is disfigured by a slight touch of affectation, by little conceits which smell of the oil;--but the language is always lucid.

The section ends with out and out adverse criticism of Thackeray's final work (and interestingly of the period during which he was editor of the Cornhill):

> Late in Thackeray's life,--he never was an old man, but towards the end of his career,--he failed in his power of charming, because he allowed his mind to become idle. In the plots which he conceived, and in the language which he used, I do not know that there is any perceptible change; but in The Virginians and in Philip the reader is introduced to no character with which he makes a close and undying acquaintance. And this, I have no doubt, is so because Thackeray himself had no such intimacy. His mind had come to be weary of that fictitious life which is always demanding the labour of new creation, and he troubled himself with his two Virginians and his Philip only when he was seated at his desk.[81]

Since Trollope mentioned Thackeray as one of the novelists who followed poor procedures in writing and since that procedure implies that all Thackeray's major works except Esmond are inferior, this shift from unqualified praise to unlimited castigation causes Esmond to become a pivot in Thackeray's career before which he was good but not great and

after which he did not rise again to the great. After his most successful novel, Thackeray, according to Trollope, created his most successful character, Colonel Newcome, a judgment that was already stated in the Cornhill article. Yet even while Trollope may not place all Thackeray's work on an equally high level, he maintained that Thackeray was superior to both George Eliot and Charles Dickens, the two closest rivals.

The single paragraph in the autobiography that touches in detail on Thackeray's character must be quoted, despite its length:

> On Christmas day 1863 we were startled by the news of Thackeray's death. He had then for many months given up the editorship of the Cornhill Magazine,—a position for which he was hardly fitted either by his habits or temperament,—but was still employed in writing for its pages. I had known him only for four years, but had grown into much intimacy with him and his family. I regard him as one of the most tender-hearted human beings I ever knew, who, with an exaggerated contempt for the foibles of the world at large, would entertain an almost equally exaggerated sympathy with the joys and troubles of individuals around him. He had been unfortunate in early life—unfortunate in regard to money—unfortunate with an afflicted wife—unfortunate in having his home broken up before his children were fit to be his companions. This threw him too much upon clubs, and taught him to dislike general society. But it never affected his heart, or clouded his imagination. He could still revel in the pangs and joys of fictitious life, and could still feel—as he did to the very last—the duty of showing to his readers the evil consequences of evil conduct. It was perhaps his chief fault as a writer that he could never abstain from that dash of satire which he felt to be demanded by the weaknesses which he saw around him. The satirist who writes nothing but satire should write but little,—or it will seem that his satire springs rather from his own caustic nature than from the sins of the

> world in which he lives. I myself regard Esmond as the greatest novel in the English language, basing that judgment upon the excellence of its language, on the clear individuality of the characters, on the truth of its delineations in regard to the time selected, and on its great pathos. There are also in it a few scenes so told that even Scott has never equalled the telling. Let any one who doubts this read the passage in which Lady Castlewood induces the Duke of Hamilton to think that his nuptials with Beatrice will be honoured if Colonel Esmond will give away the bride. When he went from us he left behind living novelists with great names; but I think that they who best understood the matter felt that the greatest master of fiction of this age had gone.[82]

Here the adverse and the laudatory opinions merge in a rather confusing manner; unlike the adverse criticism of the Cornhill article, the negative attributes do not serve here to emphasize the positive. Instead they assume almost a balance in which neither fully emerges as predominate. He relates that Thackeray was the editor of the Cornhill, but he adds that he was unsuited for the position: in other words, the initial judgment is negative. Then he relates his intimacy with Thackeray and highly praises him only to follow this praise by castigating him for his dislike of society and for being a satirist. These rapid shifts of point of view remain until he reaches Thackeray the artist and his masterpiece; then the writer is entirely laudatory. The ambivalence of the first two-thirds of the paragraph, however, weakens the final praise; Trollope has taken his reader through so many shifts without emphasizing the one side above the other that confusion rather than reasoned criticism is the result. He almost drives the reader to think that his judgment is unfounded, a conclusion that he later invites after

discussing George Eliot and Dickens when he adds: "To me it almost seems that I must be wrong to place Dickens after Thackeray and George Eliot, knowing as I do that so great a majority put him above those authors."[83]

If Trollope praised Thackeray as an artist without qualification, his judgment would be questionable, but he did not. In the autobiography he obviously has a wide range of opinions concerning Thackeray: Esmond and Colonel Newcome place Thackeray in the highest rank of English literature; Thackeray's procedure of writing is the lowest. Thackeray's tenderness and generosity place him foremost among men, but his satirical outlook and his idleness hide him behind the more personable. When the gloss of sentimentality has been removed, Thackeray, as seen by Trollope, was humanly weak but creatively strong; he was an artist to admire, who could overcome faulty procedures to create a Colonel Newcome, but a man who was weak and struck others because he was himself of a "caustic nature." Trollope had come to love Thackeray as an artist, but evidently the love for the man never developed even though he could recognize the good in Thackeray's character. To recognize this good, however, is not to have a close friendship based on love with a fellow creature; such friendship emerges only from understanding, and this quality Trollope lacked. On the portrait of Thackeray presented by the autobiography only one conclusion is possible: Trollope's opinion of Thackeray the man remained influenced by the Yates-Dickens's circle, with whom Trollope was on intimate terms, although he was a visitor in Thackeray's home and a

friend of Thackeray's family. Since the influence remained strong, Trollope, who was obviously drawn to Thackeray's works as the finest in English literature, was unable to penetrate into Thackeray's personality, unable to understand or finally to appreciate him as anything other than a literary figure. Thackeray the man seems to have been a myth never analyzed by Trollope.

Notes

[1]Leslie Stephen, Studies of a Biographer (London, 1902), IV, 171-172.

[2]Autobiography, p. 126.

[3]Laurence Irving, Henry Irving: The Actor and His World (London, 1951), pp. 230-232.

[4]Sadleir, p. 205.

[5]Sala, Life and Adventures, p. 354.

[6]Recollections and Experiences, II, 58.

[7]Autobiography, p. 127.

[8]See Yates's original reply to Thackeray in Recollections and Experiences, II, 15.

[9]Thackeray Letters, IV, 133-134, fn.17.

[10]Irving, p. 161.

[11]Sala, Life and Adventures, pp. 324-325.

[12]Dairy for 1861. Thackeray Letters, IV, 397.

[13]William Makepeace Thackeray, Thackeray's Letters to An American Family With An Introduction by Lucy W. Baxter and Original Drawings by Thackeray (New York, 1904), p. 174.

[14]Wisdom, pp. 303-304.

[15]Ibid., p. 388.

[16]Letter of May 13, 1861, to Isabella Blagden. Edward C. McAleer (ed.), Dearest Isa: Robert Browning's Letters to Isabella Blagden (Austin, 1951), pp. 76-77.

[17]George Eliot Letters, III, 434.

[18]Thackeray Letters, IV, 255.

[19]Autobiography, pp. 130-131.

[20]Wisdom, pp. 316-317.

[21]McAleer, p. 105.

[22]George Eliot Letters, IV, 24.

[23]Ibid., IV, 29.

[24]Autobiography, p. 122.

[25]Thackeray, p. 60.

[26]Sadleir, p. 254; Booth, p. 14.

[27]Thackeray Letters, III, 210, fn.89.

[28]Ibid., pp. 210-211.

[29]Ibid., pp. 219-220.

[30]Ibid., p. 291.

[31]Wisdom, pp. 348-352.

[32]Thackeray Letters, IV, 262-263.

[33]Ibid., p. 400.

[34]Trollope Letters, p. 143.

[35]Thackeray Letters, IV, 408.

[36]Ibid., p. 411.

[37]Letter from Trollope to W. W. Follett Synge. Trollope Letters, p. 142.

[38]Widsom, pp. 404-405.

[39]George Eliot Letters, IV, 122.

[40]McAleer, pp. 184-185.

[41]Edmund Downey (ed.), Charles Lever: His Life in His Letters (Edinburgh, 1906), II, 2.

[42]Recollections and Experiences, II, 80-81.

[43]Forster, p. 711.

[44]Trollope Letters, p. 141.

[45]Ibid., pp. 142-143.

[46]Ibid., p. 142.

[47]Ibid., p. 144.

[48]Hester Thackeray Ritchie (ed.), Thackeray and His Daughter, The Letters and Journals of Anne Thackeray Ritchie, With Many Letters of William Makepeace Thackeray, Selected and Edited by Hester Thackeray Ritchie (New York, 1924), p. 129.

[49]Anthony Trollope, "W. M. Thackeray," The Cornhill Magazine, IX (February, 1864), 134.

[50]G. H. Lewes's entry for January 1, 1864, in his journal. George Eliot Letters, IV, 126.

[51]Trollope, "W. M. Thackeray," p. 137.

[52]Trollope neither mentions nor alludes to any event before 1860.

[53]Trollope, "W. M. Thackeray," p. 134.

[54]Ibid., pp. 134-135.

[55]Ibid., pp. 136 and 137.

[56]Ibid., p. 136.

[57]Trollope Letters, p. 146.

[58]Ibid., p. 156.

[59]Dickens wrote: "We had our differences of opinion. I thought that he too much feigned a want of earnestness, and that he made a pretence of undervaluing his art, which was not good for the art that he held in trust. But, when we fell upon these topics, it was never gravely, and I have a lively image of him in my mind, twisting both his hands in his hair and stamping about, to make an end of the discussion." "In Memoriam," The Cornhill Magazine, IX (February, 1864), 130.

[60]Letter of January 24, 1864, to Wilkie Collins. Laurence Hutton (ed), Letters of Charles Dickens to Wilkie Collins, 1851-1870; Selected by Miss Georgina Hogarth (London, 1892), p. 145.

[61]Dickens, "In Memoriam," p. 132.

[62]Ibid., pp. 130-131.

[63]Ibid., p. 130.

[64]Trollope, "W. H. Thackeray," p. 135.

[65]Autobiography, p. 126.

[66]Ibid., p. 127.

[67]Recollections and Experiences, II, 231.

[68]Autobiography, pp. 211-212.

[69]Ibid., p. 214.

[70]Sadleir, pp. 205-206.

[71]Recollections and Experiences, II, 232.

[72]Trollope Letters, p. 484.

[73]Autobiography, p. 5.

[74]Ibid., p. 72.

[75]Ibid., p. 174.

[76]Ibid., p. 195.

[77]Ibid., p. 89.

[78]Ibid., p. 190.

[79] Ibid., p. 113.

[80] Ibid., p. 186.

[81] Ibid., p. 187.

[82] Ibid., pp. 145-146.

[83] Ibid., p. 190.

CHAPTER V

TROLLOPE'S THACKERAY: THE MANIPULATION OF FACT

While Trollope wrote An Autobiography for a posthumous publication, the volume in the English Men of Letters series was written for immediate publication; therefore, we must understand how Trollope came to write it and the manner in which he gathered information for the project. As the death of Thackeray was followed by Trollope's increasing club life and popularity, the image of Thackeray evolved from the sentimental to the more honest, but in Thackeray the knowledge that his writing would be read while he was living caused Trollope to mix the honest opinion that he held of Thackeray with a degree of sentimentality that he felt was demanded by certain of his readers. One of these persons was Thackeray's daughter Anne, or as she is better known, Lady Ritchie. This daughter, who contributed much to Thackerayan biography, was a sentimentalist herself;[1] hence Trollope, who had apparently grown familiar with her while Thackeray lived, softened some of his barbs because she helped him despite her father's orders to the contrary. The relation between Trollope and Lady Ritchie is, therefore, a basic key to the understanding of Thackeray.

On the dates that Trollope dined at Thackeray's house he probably saw the eldest daughter, but he knew her primarily from their relation to the Cornhill. Since she became associated with this magazine in May, 1860, when her "Little Scholars" appeared in its pages and since she acted as her father's secretary during the final years of his life, there are good grounds for believing that she and Trollope knew rather much of each other before 1864. That this acquaintance was no mere crossing of paths is attested as early as 1865 in Lady Ritchie's journal:

> Early in the year to Waltham Cross to stay at the Trollopes'. It was a sweet prim chill house wrapped in snow.
>
> The Merivales were staying there too. I remember so well saying to Rose Merivale how terrible this pain of parting was and would it ever cease? She said: "Life is over so quickly, so very quickly," and now I feel how true that is.
>
> I can also remember in the bitter cold dark morning hearing Mr. Trollope called at four o'clock. He told me he gave his man half a crown every time he (Mr. Trollope) didn't get up! "The labourer is worthy of his hire," said Mr. Trollope in his deep cheerful lispy voice.[2]

A young lady would not have accepted an invitation to visit a man's home, especially for a length of time as this entry indicates, unless she was rather well acquainted with her host. Later, presumably still in the 1860's since no mention is made of her husband,[3] the Trollopes and Lady Ritchie enjoyed an excursion:

> I once saw an artist at work in a little wood near a knole on a certain day in July, when we all started on a happy expedition Mrs. Millais invited me to join. Her sister was there, and the Trollopes, and Mr. Charles

> Clifford. We had found sunshine everywhere, and a drag at Sevenoaks, and as we walked through the woods, we came upon this painter at work under the trees. Our host stopped for a moment, "Why," said he to the painter, "you have not got your lights right. Look, this is what you want." And he took the brush out of the painter's hand, and made a line or two on the picture, and then nodded to him and walked away.
>
> Mr. Trollope laughed, and said, "The man looks bewildered; he ought to know it is Millais," and he ran back and told him. Then some one else [Lady Ritchie] laughed, and said, "He ought to know it is Trollope." So a second message was conveyed to the unfortunate painter, and greatly amused we all walked on through the woods to where the carriage was waiting.[4]

The carefree joviality is obvious; this was the affair of friends who apparently enjoyed being together. On May 3, 1869, Trollope wrote to Mary Holmes to tell her that Lady Ritchie was in Italy; therefore, he was close enough to her to know her whereabouts. When he endeavored to help Miss Holmes publish some verse in the Cornhill in May, 1874, he sent the manuscript to Lady Ritchie because her brother-in-law, Leslie Stephen, was editor; he explained, "Annie wrote to me in answer, but said nothing about the verses."[5] Apparently Miss Holmes wrote later that year giving Trollope her opinion of Lady Ritchie and George Eliot as novelists, for on September 18, he replied, "I do not quite agree in all your criticism, touching A. Thackeray and G. Elliot;--not that I do not like Annie's work, but I prefer George Elliots very much."[6] When he heard of the death of Thackeray's younger daughter, Minny Thackeray Stephen, on November 26, 1875, Trollope sent Lady Ritchie a brief but moving letter of condolence that alone witnesses his familiarity with the deceased and with the living:

> I do not know how to write to you, or how to be silent. I send one word to say that we have thought of your grief, and of his [Leslie Stephen's], with many tears.[7]

Lady Ritchie remained disconsolate over the death until well into 1876, for on May 7, 1876, Trollope wrote to Miss Holmes:

> I have not yet seen Annie T. though I have been to see her two or three times. My wife has seen her, and found her fairly well. Him (Leslie Stephen) I have seen various times. But a man recovers himself from all that so much quicker than a woman.[8]

On May 31 he forwarded a letter to her with a short note that added, ". . . how glad I should be if I could see you."[9] For at least sixteen years, therefore, Trollope and Lady Ritchie were acquainted, although the depth of their acquaintance cannot be probed in any other way than assuming that they knew each other personally, apparently liked each other, and joined in common bonds of sorrow at least twice, at the deaths of Thackeray and Minny Stephen. Trollope's closeness to Thackeray's daughter is, perhaps, best stated by a passage in his autobiography in which he praises her talent and gently raps her fingers for faults inherited from her father:

> There are two ladies of whom I would fain say a word, though I feel that I am making my list [of contemporary novelists] too long, in order that I may declare how much I have admired their work. They are Annie Thackeray and Rhoda Broughton. I have known them both, and have loved the former almost as though she belonged to me. No two writers were ever more dissimilar,—except in this that they are both feminine. Miss Thackeray's characters are sweet, charming, and quite true to human nature. In her writings she is always endeavouring to prove that good produces good,

> and evil evil. There is not a line of which she need be ashamed,—not a sentiment of which she should not be proud. But she writes like a lazy writer who dislikes her work, and who allows her own want of energy to show itself in her pages.[10]

Lady Ritchie wished to obey her father's commandment that there be no biography of him, and when Edward Fitzgerald, Thackeray's friend of long standing, suggested in 1865 that she commission Tom Taylor to do a biography, she refused. On May 14 he withdrew his proposal:

> I think it is much [the] best to have no memoir of your father: as you say, he is in his Books. I only suggested Tom Taylor in case there were any; or to anticipate some stupid Cockney, should any such project such a work.[11]

While the family could not prevent unauthorized biographies or collections of anecdotes, some did creep into print. On June 20, 1891, seven years before she turned biographer herself in the "Biographical Introductions," Lady Ritchie stated her position:

> People sometimes regret that my father left no autobiography, and that no important printed book has been published about his life; but I cannot help thinking that whatever may or may not be published in the future, his life has been told by himself, in his own pages, better than any other person can tell it, for those who have eyes to see and ears to hear; and that it has been best read by those who best appreciated him and his works.[12]

Twelve years before she made this statement, Leslie Stephen summed up the same position, and Leslie Stephen's comments are of additional interest since they appeared the same year as Trollope's little volume:

> Mr. Thackeray intimated to his daughters during his life that he wished them to heve no concern in any biography of their father. His known wishes were necessarily regarded as final by them. The family representatives of an eminent man may often feel it to be not merely a right but a duty to publish his life. But it is a duty for the discharge of which they are responsible to their own consciences and not to the public. The decision must rest upon the particular circumstances of the case, and involves considerations which can be fully known to none but the persons immediately concerned. . . . This alone may be said; and I say it with the most entire conviction of its truth. Nothing could be told of Mr. Thackeray's private life by those who have the fullest means of knowledge which would not confirm the highest estimate derivable from his writings of the tenderness of his heart and the moral worth of his nature; and all that could be told would tend to justify the profound affection with which they cherish his memory.[13]

The appearance of Trollope's volume, therefore, demands some definitions: what to Thackeray's family constituted a "biography"? In the final volume of the Biographical Edition of Thackeray's Works of 1898-1899, Lady Ritchie introduces Leslie Stephen's account of Thackeray's life: "In his biography of my father, reprinted from the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' the whole framework of the life is given: the story he purposely left for me to tell."[14] Stephen himself called the article, "little more than a condensed statement of facts."[15] In the opening of the first chapter of Thackeray, entitled "Biographical,"[16] Trollope prefaces his work by telling of Thackeray's condemnation of biography and outlining his purpose:

> Acting upon these instructions, his daughter,—while there were two living, and since that the one surviving,—have carried out the order which has appeared to them to be sacred. Such being the case, it certainly is not my purpose now to write what may be called a life of Thackeray.

> In this preliminary chapter I will give such incidents and anecdotes of his life as will tell the reader perhaps all about him that a reader is entitled to ask. I will tell how he became an author, and will say how first he worked and struggled, and then how he worked and prospered, and became a household word in English literature. . . . Then I will tell how Thackeray died, early indeed, but still having done a good life's work. Something of his manner, something of his appearance I can say, something perhaps of his condition of mind; because for some few years he was known to me. But of the continual intercourse of himself with the world, and of himself with his own works, I can tell little, because no record of his life has been made public.[17]

The meaning of the word "biography" as understood by these people is apparently exemplified by John Forster's life of Charles Dickens, a voluminous complilation of letters, memoirs, and personal or intimate glances into the subject's personality accompanied by a desire to eulogize the subject or probe into his emotions and private feelings. If this type of work represented biographical writing to them, only Lady Ritchie's commodious introductions begin to touch the genre. Yet Trollope's single chapter opened, as we shall see, the way for these introductions because they engendered vitriolic attacks by many of Thackeray's old enemies, especially Yates and Disraeli. The difference between "the story" and the "framework," Lady Ritchie's own terms for the subjective or personal probing of the subject's mind and emotions and the more objective or public data which makes up the bulk of the articles in the Dictionary of National Biography, accounts for her reaction to Trollope's book:

> Mr. Trollope, that kind old friend who knew him so much, saw him from a very different point of view from mine, but he writes with an affection which never varied, and which was ever constant to my father's children, though not untried, I fear, by the present writer.[18]

Since Trollope was not writing a voluminous account of Thackeray, the help of Thackeray's family is not unusual; Lady Ritchie apparently felt that she could aid her friend in his work because it was not to be a standard life but a critical summary that needed to be placed in a biographical context.

The English Men of Letters Series was established by John Morley, who described the series as being "a useful contribution to knowledge, criticism, and reflection, and bringing all these three good things within reach of an extensive, busy, and preoccupied world."[19] When Morley had procured Trollope's agreement to do the volume and had secured the assent of Thackeray's family, he wrote to Trollope giving him the word to go ahead with the writing:

> Brighton.
> Jan. 27. 79
>
> My dear Trollope,
>
> I am delighted that it is to be, and particularly as we have such friendly assent from Stephen and his sister-in-law. But I confess to a touch of disappointment that the world is never to have a full life of him, and a selection from his letters, which must have been full of flavour. I don't know how far you will feel free to tell his story, but I hope you will give us as much as ever you can in the personal vein, by way of background to the critical and descriptive.
>
> The end of March will do perfectly well. In fact I shall hardly be ready before. So I will book you for Mar. 31, w^{h} is exactly 9 weeks from to-day.

> It is to be not less than 180 pp., nor more than 200; and perhaps I ought to write down on paper what I mentioned to you, that the fee is to be 200£ (say two hundred pounds—as they put so mysteriously in legal documents—why, I wonder?)
>
> Macmillan is quite as well pleased as I am at your accession to our band.
>
> I return Stephen's letter. When the day comes, I will tell you the printers to whom copy is to be sent.
>
> Yours always,
> JOHN MORLEY.[20]

After this, Trollope's major concern was to gather information, a particularly trying endeavor since he had not known Thackeray before 1860. He began writing where he knew the most—a chapter on Henry Esmond, but after sixteen pages he was desperate:

> . . . I have got the Thackeray in hand and a terrible job I find it. There is absolutely nothing to say,—except washed out criticism. But it had to be done, and no one would do it so lovingly.[21]

Meanwhile, he sought help on the biographical chapter; he wrote to friends at the Garrick Club who might remember Thackeray and even sent a questionnaire to Lady Ritchie. Because he began writing this chapter on February 9, 1879, we can assume that he had finished gathering the most necessary data.

Since Thackeray's most recent biographer asserts that "if biographical data of value occasionally found their way into print, it was against the family's wishes" and adds that "Trollope's appeal for information . . . was neatly parried both by Lady Ritchie and by Fitzgerald,"[22] the questions and Lady Ritchie's answers are of great interest. While it is true that Lady Ritchie's answers to Trollope's

twenty-three questions are brief, the questions are adequately answered. Since Lady Ritchie's help is extremely important in judging the volume, each question and answer will be traced into the text. Before we do this, however, it is necessary to mention the other sources of Trollope's information. Edward Fitzgerald, in a letter written early in 1882, described his part in the volume when W. F. Pollack's son was planning a biography of Thackeray:

> . . . I will answer as well as I can any questions put to me; or look over, and annotate, any proof sent to me, as I did in Mr. Trollope's case. MS. I have not the eyes for. I almost wish your Son had not undertaken the job for Scribner, remembering Annie's telling me what her Father said not long before his Death. "When I drop let there be nothing written of me." Mr. Trollope (unto whom I wish you would make my respects) wrote his Book under Annie's eyes (who misinformed him in many ways), and, as your Walter is a Gentleman as well as Mr. T., I will do all for him I did for the other; and positively I can do no more.[23]

If Lady Ritchie helped Trollope but misinformed him, added complications enter the volume. Whether Fitzgerald means that she helped further than the questionnaire is doubtful; if she did, Fitzgerald's comment is analogous to her portrait painted by Noel Gilroy Annan in his biography of Leslie Stephen:

> Annie and Minny were by no means pliable, and since Minny sided with her sister, Leslie found himself to his chagrin only half her master. "Annie and Minny used to call me the cold bath from my habit of drenching Annie's little schemes and fancies with chilling criticism." Stephen could never realize that the weighty analysis applied to destroying a chapter of Buckle had no relevance in his sister-in-law's world. But there was worse to come. Annie not only muddled her facts, she muddled her figures. . . . Worst of all, she

> would talk in the evenings when he wished to be silent and of these occasions he said in self-defence, "she was always the aggressor." . . . Eventually her fabulous departure from factual truth stirred Stephen to reproof, and as his sister-in-law was exclaiming, "Indeed, I tell my maid everything," he groaned, "Oh, yes Annie, and we do wish you wouldn't," relapsing again into the twilight of his thoughts while Annie's peals of laughter rang round the icy dining-room.[24]

Perhaps it is unfair to question the veracity of one of the major sources of Thackerayan biography, but even Lady Ritchie herself invited such criticism when she objected to James T. Field's paper in the Atlantic Monthly by writing:

> An anecdote I sh^d like omitted is that one of my father attempting to put his legs out of the window (w^h of course he would not have thought of really doing) another w^h seemed to me not characteristic of him was his stopping in the street to make a quotation about the Edinbro' speech it seemed to me that altho' I of course understand that you meant to describe him as laughing at himself, it would scarcely strike anyone who read it without knowing him, in that light.[25]

To wish to suppress certain anecdotes either true or false because they did not seem characteristic to the man's daughter is, indeed, presenting a false picture to the world, particularly since a man does not always behave in the same way when with his children as when accompanied by his peers. The desire to suppress such material leads eventually to the manipulation of factual details so that the writer's preconceptions will be communicated, not the unprejudiced truth. Thus Fitzgerald might well be criticising his friend's daughter for her biased, hero-worship of her father, a criticism later repeated by Virginia Woolf, Lady Ritchie's step-niece, in the character of Mrs. Hilbery in Night and Day.

Other than Lady Ritchie and Fitzgerald, Trollope sought the help of old friends of Thackeray. On February 20, for example, he acknowledged help from William Howard Russell, one of Thackeray's friends:

> Dear Russell
> Do not trouble yourself to make any MS. My biographical chapter will be finished today. I did not like to do it without letting you know, and some dozen others, so that if there were any little trifle to say, it might be said. An incident here or there I have got. What passed between us at the Club was probably more valuable than any letter.
> Yours always
> ANTHONY TROLLOPE[26]

Trollope's sources for the biographical chapter, then, seem to be fourfold: Lady Ritchie, Edward Fitzgerald, Thackeray's old friends, and personal experience. The last, as will be seen, colored the others so that the work is basically Trollopian even though details have been gathered from a rather wide area after only a fortnight's work.

As mentioned before, Trollope was an extremely methodical writer and kept a notebook in which he registered the amount of work done each day. The following table is his own daily tabulation for the Thackeray, and in it the work done between February 9 and 20 has been carefully recorded. Since he had each page counted to be recorded at 250 words, we can assume from the table that he had the majority of his information already gathered by the time he began, which perhaps accounts for the blanks during the first weeks:

1879	Thackeray	240 pages	250 cash 5 a day 35 a week
Feb	Ch.1-3[?]	6	
Sat 1			
Sun 2			
Mon 3	Esmond	2	23
Tues 4		1	
Wed 5		7	
Th 6			
Fri 7		7	
Sa 8	———		23
S 9	Chap 1-[?] 9	6	
M 10		7	
T 11	17-21	5	30
W 12	22-26	5	
T 13	27-28-29	3	
F 14	30 33	4	
S 15	34 to 37	4	53
S 16	38 to 43	6	
M 17	44 to 50	7	
T 18	51 to 56	6	
W 19	57 to 61	5	34
T 20	61 to 67	6	
F 21			
S 22			87
S 23			
M 24		6	
T 25		5	
W 26		6	
T 27		7	
F 28			
March			
S 1		6	
S 2		2	
M 3		7	
T 4		5	
W 5		6	
T 6		6	
F 7		6	
S 8		4	
S 9		6	
M 10		5	
T 11		5	
W 12		4	
T 13		2	
F 14		2	

S 15	5
S 16	5
M 17	5
T 18	7
W 19	
T 20	8
F 21	5
S 22	5
S 23	5
M 24	7
T 25	3

27

A comparison of this table with the section for September, 1864, of his notebooks, kept when he was writing The Claverings reveals the slow pace of his composition:

Sept. 1	11-20	16	No. 4. 1-10
2	21-30	17	11-20
3	.....	18	21-30
4	31-38	19	31-40
5	39-48	20	41-48
6	.....	21	No. 5. 1-12
7	Writing Malachi's	22	13-24
8	Cove.	23	25-36
9		24	37-48
10	No. 3. 1-12	25	No. 6. 1-12
11	13-24	26	13-24
12	25-36	27	25-32
13	37-48	28	33-42
14	.....	29	43-48
15	.....	30	No. 7. 1-8

28

While the average number of pages per day for The Claverings is ten, Trollope averaged only about five per day, and at his best wrote only seven, when writing the English Men of Letters volume. The volume was hard for him to write because it was a biographical and critical review of another novelist while The Claverings was a novel but also because Trollope is obviously at odds with the task before him. He wanted to

create a work of love[29] that would please Thackeray's daughter but also would remain honest to the opinion of Thackeray that he had expressed in An Autobiography three years before. The result of this two-fold drive is the ambivalence of the finished work, an ambivalence that we have already traced from the inception of his image of Thackeray when he still befriended Edmund Yates.

In later volume (1928) of the English Men of Letters series, Hugh Walpole helped to propagate an illogical and unfounded idea of Trollope's Thackeray that has unfortunately been accepted without much serious consideration.

> Trollope loved his friend so deeply that one can feel the throb of his affection in every page of this book, but at the same time he would tell no lies, but would write what seemed to him to be the truth. He knew Thackeray only in his later years, with the result that he leaves a rather unfortunate portrait of a man bowed down with pain and sickness and loneliness, someone a little acid from melancholy although loyal and charming to his close friends.[30]

When we analyze the volume, separating the elements supplied from various sources, we can see into the nature of Trollope's opinion of Thackeray. Such analysis means that the source of each section in the volume, especially in the first chapter, must be identified and that those passages which cannot be attributed to a source must be set aside as revealing Trollope's own opinion. The greatest aid to this analysis is the following questionnaire sent to Lady Ritchie and her answers.[31] Since the manner in which Trollope utilized her information is of utmost importance in determining the full extent of her help, some of which

(as we shall see) must have been oral, the relation between these documents and the completed book may form a basis from which the non-Trollopian elements can be removed.

1. Date and place of his birth

   — Ans. Calcutta. July 18 1811

2. Names of his parents. Any details as to the family— especially his mother—

   — Ans. His Father was Richmond Thackeray the 7th son of Wm Makepeace Thackeray lately of Hadley on [?] . They were both Indian civil servants. His mother was Anne Becher whose father was also in the Company's service. She went to India and married young. She was only 19 when my father was born. She was left a widow in 1816 & was married a year or so afterwards to Major Henry Carmichael Smith.

3. His education. Charter House when; for How long; Cambridge how long & when at what college.

   — Ans. Feb. 1829. 17 years old.
   Trinity Coll. Last letter from there Nov [?] 29

4. What fortune did he inherit.

   — No Answer.

5. Soon spent of course there is a story current as to this

   — Ans. Some went in an Indian Bank, a great deal in a newspaper which he & his Step-father started. About 1500 went in cards.

6. How did he live & where on leaving Cambridge till he began to earn money by writing in London

   — Ans. After leaving Cambridge he went to Weimar

7. Did he study drawing & where

   — Ans. He studied drawing in Paris under Bonington

8. When was he at Weimar and for how long

—No Answer.

9. When was he in Paris and for how long

—Ans. ~~&~~ ~~yrs~~ 1830
15 Dec 1830
Feb 1831

10. When did he first settle in London

— Ans. Off and on after leaving College. His parents lived in Devonshire & he used to go there and stay after his marriage.

11. For what work was he first paid & how much. Were not his first payments very small.

— Ans. Fraser. The Times. The Constitutional.

12. When was he married. What was your Mothers name

— Ans. Sept 1837, to Isabella Shawe daughter of Col Mathew Shawe

13. When were the three girls born and how named

— Ans. 1837. 1839. 1840. Anne Jane Harriet.

14. There should be a word about Amy Crowe. How long was she with you

— Ans. From 1853 to 1862 when she married Ed. Thackeray

15. Names and dates of his London residences

— Ans. Albion St 1837. Gt Coram St 1836-40
St James St Chambers
13 Young St Kensington 1847-1853
36 Onslow Sqr 1853-1862
Palace Green 1862-1863

16. A list of his writings as nearly chronological as possible with dates of publication

— Ans. Mrs. Perkins Xmas books, Ch & H.
V F. Pen- Bradbury & Evans
Esmond. Roundabout. Phillip. Smith & El

I have not got all the original editions
Hogarthy diamond 1838 or 9 B & E
Vanity Fair 1848 Paris Sketch Book 1840
Pendennis 1850 Irish — 1843
Esmond 1852
Newcomes 1854
Virginians 1858
Roundabout papers 1862
Phillip

17. How were his books published & by whom
in Fraser
Punch
or in other periodicals or by what publishers

— No Answer.

18. A list of the lectures he gave / were there any besides the 4 Georges and the Humourists. Were all the Humourists, as presented given as lectures
The places where they were given in England, and America
In what Hall in London

— Ans. There was Charles which he kept I think fr charities
53 humourists 55 Georges
Edenbro. Newcastle- Glasgow. Leeds.
Sheffield Oxford Cambridge
Devonshire & Willis' Evans

19. Date of his trip to America
Is it not the case that the lectures in America were more profitable in England

When did he first [?] himself Thackeray

— Ans. October 1852 & 3 1855 [?]
Yes. All the money he made in America he laid by for us.

20. Are there particular friends to whom reference should be made
He told me himself that he had owed most [?] to Shirley Brooks
Higgins & But he was alluding to pecuniary obligations

— Ans. Mr. & Mrs. Brookfield Mrs Elliot & Miss Perry.
Ed. Fitzgerald
Sir Henry Dawson
Mrs. Fladgate
were people he was very proud of.

21. He told me shortly before his death that he was worth then exactly the sum of money that we inherited on coming of age--He mentioned a sum--I think it was £30,000.

--Ans. He left about £730 a year including 5000 for the copyrights after dues & taxes were paid

22. For some years before his death he was a sufferer When did that begin

-- Ans. He had a dreadful fever wile he was writing Pendennis. At Rome he was again ill & ever afterwards suffered from spasms & constant pain & uneasiness--

23. Can you give me any other details of his life

-- Ans. Jerusalem about 1843. Rome 53,4
Oxford Election
Cornhill Magazine

Lady Ritchie failed to answer only three of Trollope's questions, not because she desired to thwart the novelist but because she was ignorant of the facts demanded. Trollope's fourth question, "What fortune did he inherit," poses the typical problem. Evidently Lady Ritchie had no reason to wish to suppress this information, for she later details the amount of her own inheritance. If she wished to conceal the first, she presumably would not have given the second; therefore, her reticence is more than likely the result of a lack of knowledge, an assumption on our part that appears to be entirely logical since Thackeray would have had little occasion to pass such information to his child. The eighth question, "When was he at Weimar and for how long," again demands information that Lady Ritchie would probably not know. Just as Trollope knew that Thackeray had been in Weimar (or he could not have asked the question in the first place), Lady Ritchie, while being aware that her

father had made such a trip, would scarcely be capable of ascertaining precise dates for an event that occurred before her parent's marriage. The third unanswered question, seventeen, asked:

> How were his books published & by whom
> in Fraser
> Punch
> or in other periodicals or by what publishers

She answered this in part in another place, but the silence on her part is easily attributed again to her lack of knowledge, since the question demands of her a bibliographer's information that she obviously did not have, because in her answer to question sixteen she inserts, as an explanation of her omission of some material, "I have not got all the original editions." These questions posed the necessity of more knowledge than Lady Ritchie had, since she was only twenty-five when her father died almost sixteen years before Trollope was gathering information. The most detailed and accurate memory of her father could not predate her tenth birthday, the year Vanity Fair was published, and probably no clearly adult view could be formed prior to the time when she was fifteen or sixteen, the period of The Four Georges and Thackeray's lectures.

Three more questions were answered, but the answers were not used in the biographical chapter, although the knowledge has become infused into Trollope's account. The ninth question, "When was he in Paris and for how long," like the eighth, demanded factual knowledge beyond Lady Ritchie's ability. Apparently she referred to the dates of some letters, for her answer cryptically reads:

$ ~~yrs~~ 1830
15 Dec 1830
Feb 1831

The crossed out "$ ~~yrs~~" reveals her attempt to answer that which she doesn't know, but obviously unable to leave such ambiguity she supplied the only dates she could. Trollope incorporates this data, joined with other answers, into the vague statement, "Between Weimar and Paris he spent some portion of his earlier years. . . ."[32] Trollope's eighteenth question was one of his most lengthy:

> A list of the lectures he gave / were there
> any besides the 4 Georges and the Humorists.
> Were all the Humourists, as presented given as
> lectures
> The places where they were given in England, and
> America
> In what Hall in London

Lady Ritchie answered this question, remaining silent on the places in America where the lectures had been presented since she was uninformed:

> There was Charles which he kept I think fr charities
> 53 humourists 55 Georges
> Edenbro. Newcastle- Glasgow. Leeds.
> Sheffield Oxford Cambridge
> Devonshire & Willis' Evans

This detailed information has been widely scattered through the volume in places in which the lectures are mentioned, but no outstanding use is made of it. In the twentieth question, Trollope asked:

> Are there particular friends to whom reference
> should be made He told me himself that he had
> owed most [?] to Shirley Brooks Higgins &
> But he was alluding to pecuniary obligations

Again Lady Ritchie was full in her answer, although she offers no reasons for the particular list, probably because she was not asked:

Mr & Mrs Brookfield Mrs Elliot & Miss Perry
Ed. Fitzgerald
Sir Henry Dawson
Mrs Fladgate
were people he was very fond of.

Of these people only Edward Fitzgerald is mentioned in Thackeray, although Frank Fladgate's name appears in the list of Thackeray's acquaintances.[33] Included with these questions and answers is question twenty-three, "Can you give me any other details of his life," which received the ambiguous answer:

Jerusalem about 1843. Rome 53,4
Oxford Election
Cornhill Magazine

Trollope does not mention either the trip to Jerusalem or to Rome in the biographical chapter, but he does speak at length on the other two details. Altogether seven of the twenty-three questions were not used in Trollope's writing; therefore, the sixteen remaining questions were incorporated. The unanswered and the unused questions are of interest because here Trollope has over-estimated the recollection of his correspondent or has changed plans in his writing; apparently he was so desperate in his search for information that he asked some of the questions hoping to have some leads upon which to build.

The first question that Trollope asked, "Date and place of his birth," reveals Trollope's desire to substantiate factual information since both parts were widely known and had even been published in American newspapers two decades before.[34] Lady Ritchie's answer, "Calcutta. July 18 1811," forms the substance of Trollope's first statement after describing the purpose of the chapter, "William Makepeace

Thackeray was born at Calcutta, on July 18, 1811."[35] The second question was not this simple; Trollope asked, "Names of his parents. Any details as to the family—especially his mother—" Lady Ritchie's answer was quite full:

> His Father was Richmond Thackeray the 7th son of Wm Makepeace Thackeray lately of Hadley on [?]. They were both Indian civil servants. His mother was Anne Beecher whose father was also in the Company's service. She went out to India and married young. She was only 19 when my father was born. She was left a widow in 1816 & was married a year or so afterwards to Major Henry Carmichael Smith.

In Thackeray, Trollope utilized this information almost verbatim, although a paragraph is inserted after the first sentence.

> His father was Richmond Thackeray, son of W. M. Thackeray of Hadley, near Barnet, in Middlesex. . . . His father and grandfather were Indian civil servants. His mother was Anne Beecher, whose father was also in the Company's service. She married early in India, and was only nineteen when her son was born. She was left a widow in 1816, with only one child, and was married a few years afterwards to Major Henry Carmichael Smyth. . . .[36]

Except for his commission of Lady Ritchie's "the 7th" and "lately" in the first sentence and the addition in the same place of geographical details and the phrase "with only one child" in the last sentence, the only changes are verbal and the alteration of "married a year or so afterwards" to "married a few years later" for propriety's sake. This information was inserted into the book with much less change than her answer to Trollope's third question:

His education. Charter House when; for How long;
Cambridge how long & when at what college.

She answered without mentioning Charterhouse:

Feb. 1829. 17 years old.
Trinity College. Last letter from there Nov [?] 29

Trollope printed a letter in Thackeray from George Venables, the man who broke Thackeray's nose at Charterhouse and later became a close friend, to describe Thackeray's "life and doings there,"[37] but Trollope gives no dates because Lady Ritchie had remained silent. Following Venable's letter, he utilizes the information supplied by her answer: "In February, 1829, when he was not as yet eighteen, Thackeray went up to Trinity College, Cambridge, and was, I think, removed in 1830."[38] Here he altered the age from Lady Ritchie's precise, but at first misleading, statement to a more general and more quickly understood wording, but of greater importance is his alteration in the date of Thackeray's removal, which he apparently changed himself--hence "I think"--in order to connect Thackeray to The Gownsman which was not founded until late 1829.[39] As we shall see, the information that he here used probably came from Fitzgerald, who first met Thackeray at Cambridge in October, 1829,[40] and may have known of Thackeray's contributions to The Gownsman, a student periodical that ran until February 25, 1830.[41] Following the discussion of The Snob and The Gownsman, Trollope combined the answers to his sixth, seventh, and tenth questions. These three questions and the respective answers are as follows:

6. How did he live & where on leaving Cambridge till he began to earn money by writing in London

-- Ans. After leaving Cambridge he went to Weimar

7. Did he study drawing & where

-- Ans. He studied drawing in Paris under Bonington

10. When did he first settle in London

-- Ans. Off and on after leaving Cambridge. His parents lived in Devonshire & he used to go there and stay after his marriage

In Thackeray, these answers are worked together to form the brief passage that follows:

> In 1830 he left Cambridge, and went to Weimar either in that year or in 1831. Between Weimar and Paris he spent some portion of his earlier years, while his family,—his mother, that is, and his stepfather,—were living in Devonshire. It was then the purport of his life to become an artist, and he studied drawing at Paris, affecting especially Bonnington, the young English artist who had himself painted at Paris and who had died in 1828.[42]

Only the final appositive needed to come from another source, and it presents the reason for Trollope's alteration of Lady Ritchie's answer to the seventh question. Lady Ritchie placed Thackeray in Paris prior to 1828, a time before he had entered Cambridge[43] and long before his first trip to Paris in June, 1829.[44] If he studied under Bonnington, he must have studied before he left Charterhouse, a fact that Mr. Ray has not mentioned; if he did not, why did Lady Ritchie say he did? This type of factual mistake may well be the misleading advice that Fitzgerald mentioned or the fabulous manipulation of details that irritated Leslie Stephen. Regardless, Trollope learned of this

discrepancy when he discovered the date of Bonnington's death from another source and altered her faulty answer by changing the definite wording to his own more general "affecting especially Bonnington." The illogical construction of Trollope's second sentence (there being no reason in the text for the addition of the temporal clause concerning Thackeray's parents) seems to have resulted from an inordinate elipsis of a mention of Thackeray's frequent visits to Devonshire, which Lady Ritchie made abundantly clear in her answer to the tenth question. Trollope appears to have been writing this passage, a factual connective between a discussion of Thackeray's college activities and an outspoken adverse criticism of Thackeray's drawing, under much difficulty; he was uncertain in the first sentence exactly when Thackeray went to Weimar[45] and, with no transition other than the word "Weimar," introduced the illogical sentence. Apparently he thought that the word "then" in the third sentence acted as a connective, but its reference can be to Thackeray's leaving Cambridge and going to Weimar, to his spending time in Weimar and Paris, or to his parent's living in Devonshire. This awkwardness, while frequent in the factual passages in Thackeray, is less notable in those passages that relate details that Trollope knew from personal experience or that are primarily Trollope's comments on Thackeray's abilities or personality.

The fifth question and answer pose a textual problem unlike any presented by the first ten questions. Actually the fifth question was a continuation of the unanswered fourth, but Lady Ritchie had the information to reply to five:

4. What fortune did he inherit

   -- No Answer.

5. Soon spent of course there is a story current as to this

   -- Ans. Some went in an Indian Bank, a great deal in a newspaper which he & his Step-father started. About 1500 went in cards.

In Thackeray, however, this answer is incorporated into materials that obviously came from another source; in the following passage, quoted at length, I have italicized the portions that ultimately derive from Lady Ritchie's answer:

> In 1832, Thackeray came of age, and inherited his fortune,—as to which various stories have been told. It seems to have amounted to about five hundred a year, and to have passed through his hands in a year or two, interest and principal. It has been told of him that it was all taken away from him at cards,[46] but such was not the truth. *Some went in an Indian bank* in which he invested it. *A portion was lost at cards. But with some of it,—the larger part as I think,—he endeavoured in concert with his stepfather, to float a newspaper, which failed.* There seem to have been two newspapers in which he was so concerned, *The National Standard* and *The Constitutional*. On the latter he was engaged with his stepfather, and in carrying that on he lost the last of his money. *The National Standard* had been running for some weeks when Thackeray joined it, and lost his money with it. It ran only for little more than twelve months, and then, the money having gone, the periodical came to an end.[47]

If Mr. Ray is correct, both Trollope and Lady Ritchie are wrong when they place the greatest loss in the newspaper failure, for he asserts "the bulk of Richmond Thackeray's estate was lost in the collapse of the great Indian agency-houses."[48] Trollope has, again probably for propriety's sake, omitted any reference to the sum lost in gambling,

but by emphasizing the money lost in the attempt to float The National Standard, he is able to moralize in the next passage over the futility of such endeavors. Nevertheless, in the above passage only a small portion comes from the questionnaire; the source of the remainder is rather obvious. Since Lady Ritchie could have relied only on hearsay, the only other person who could supply the approximate amount of Thackeray's inheritance (Trollope's figure being only £75 too much) and the details of The National Standard would have been someone who knew Thackeray at that time. Unless he received this information from a source that is not mentioned elsewhere in the volume, Trollope was informed by Edward Fitzgerald, who was quite intimate with Thackeray at that period. It is doubtful whether Lady Ritchie was conversant with these details since she falsely implies in her answer that more was lost in the newspaper endeavor than in the bank failure and since she did not know the amount of Thackeray's inheritance.

In Thackeray's domestic matters, on the other hand, Lady Ritchie had more knowledge than anyone else whom Trollope solicited for aid; here a textual problem similar to that of question five is posed. Three sets of questions are relevant. The least difficult is the material that deals with Amy Crowe that Trollope had placed in his fourteenth question:

> 14. There should be a word about Amy Crowe. How long was she with you
>
> — Ans. From 1853 to 1862 when she married Ed. Thackeray

In the following paragraph from the book I have again italicized the material from the questionnaire:

> In 1853, Thackeray having then his own two girls to provide for, added a third to his family, and adopted Amy Crowe, the daughter of an old friend, and sister of the well-known artist now among us. How it came to pass that she wanted a home, or that this special home suited her, it would be unnecessary here to tell even if I knew. But that he did give a home to this young lady, making her in all respects the same as another daughter, should be told of him. He was a man who liked to broaden his back for the support of others, and to make himself easy under such burdens.[49] In 1862, she married a Thackeray cousin, a young officer with the Victoria Cross, Edward Thackeray, and went out to India,—where she died.[50]

Obviously Trollope knows nothing about Amy Crowe prior to 1860 except her family connections which he learned after being entertained in Thackeray's house and after meeting her; therefore, he admits his ignorance, giving only the date supplied by Lady Ritchie. The details of her marriage, on the other hand, are contrasted to his ignorance of the manner of her death; Trollope was a visitor in Thackeray's home when Amy Crowe was married, but he had apparently learned of her death afterwards, no details being given to him. Of greater complexity is the way Trollope used the fifteenth question:

15. Names and dates of his London residences

— Ans. Albion St 1837. Gt Coram St 1835-40
St James St Chambers
13 Young St Kensington 1847-1853
36 Onslow Sqr 1853-1862
Palace Green 1862-1863

The corresponding passage in which the majority of these residences are mentioned is rather surprising, for these details have been subordinated to other elements; again the italics are mine:

> In his youthful,—all but boyish,—days in London, he delighted to "put himself up" at the Bedford, in Covent Garden. Then in his early married days he lived in Albion Street, and from thence went to Great Coram Street, till his household there was broken up by his wife's illness. He afterwards took lodgings in St. James's Chambers, and then a house in Young Street, Kensington. Here he lived from 1847, when he was achieving his great triumph with Vanity Fair, down to 1852, when he removed to a house which he bought in Onslow Square. In Young Street there had come to lodge opposite to him an Irish gentleman, who, on the part of his injured country, felt very angry with Thackeray. The Irish Sketch Book had not been complimentary, nor were the descriptions which Thackeray had given generally of Irishmen; and there was extant an absurd idea that in his abominable heroine Catherine Hayes he had alluded to Miss Catherine Hayes the Irish singer. Word was taken to Thackeray that this Irishman intended to come across the street and avenge his country on the calumniator's person. Thackeray immediately called upon the gentleman, and it is said that the visit was pleasant to both parties. There certainly was no blood shed.[51]

The anecdote, not deriving from the questionnaire, presents an interesting problem. While it is the type of story a man might tell on himself either in Trollope's presence, particularly since he had resided in Ireland and would appreciate it, or in the presence of club members, Lady Ritchie recited it as within her memory when she wrote the "Biographical Introductions" in 1899. Her version is more complete than Trollope's:

> It was, I believe, in consequence of the allusion to Catherine Hayes in "Pendennis" that an incident occurred with comes within my own recollection. One evening my father received a letter signed by a Mr. Briggs, announcing that a company of young Irishmen had determined to chastise him for this, and for various other supposed personal insults of an equally serious nature, and intended to come over one by one until their purpose was accomplished. Mr. Briggs had taken lodgings opposite to our house in Young Street, and was waiting until my father should go out, to attack him.
>
> In the window of our dining-room was presently established a stout good-humoured-looking man in a mustard-coloured coat, who was, so we are told, a detective. He arrived immediately after breakfast, and spent the morning staring at the opposite doorway, while my father finished his morning's work. When lunch time came the detective descended for his meal into the kitchen. Some friends arrived to luncheon. My father said the situation was becoming ridiculous and unbearable, and to our alarm and excitement he walked straight across the street and knocked at the door of Mr. Briggs' lodging and went in. We waited wondering in the bow-window; at the end of twenty minutes or so the lodging-house door opened, and he came out, unruffled and composed. He had walked in, caused himself to be announced suddenly by the landlady; had told Mr. Briggs he was come to talk the matter over, and to find out in what he had offended him. The young man--he was a very young man-blustered at first, then suddenly cooled down and listened to reason. He had never heard of the real Catherine Hayes, the murderess, before. He seems to have been surprisingly amenable to explanation, and after ten minutes' conversation, to my father's great relief, he actually promised to go back to Ireland. And so he did, that very evening.[52]

Here is a possibility of Trollope's learning an anecdote from the daughter rather than the father, although whichever may be the ultimate source for the passage in Thackeray cannot with accuracy be determined. That Lady Ritchie had remembered the episode and thought it important enough to add to her "Biographical Introductions" may well indicate that she

was the probable source, and that Trollope, having heard the anecdote from her, inserted in the most convenient place in his account, the passage describing Thackeray's residences. The third set of questions is by far the most complex; questions twelve and thirteen appear in the questionnaire as follows:

12. When was he married. What was your Mothers name

-- Ans. Sept 1837, to Isabella Shawe daughter of Col Mathew Shawe.

13. When were the three girls born and how named

-- Ans. 1837. 1839. 1840. Anne Jane Harriet.

Obviously Lady Ritchie has made a mistake in the date of her parent's marriage; actually Thackeray married Isabella Shawe on August 20, 1836,[53] and Anne was born on June 9, 1937.[54] To have later claimed such intimate knowledge of her father, Lady Ritchie certainly reveals a total ignorance here, especially since she places the date of her parent's marriage some three months after her own birth. But Trollope had no other source, so he used the incorrect date. These two questions are joined in the opening sentence of a rather important paragraph:

> In 1837 Thackeray married Isabella, daughter of Colonel Matthew Shawe, and from this union there came three daughters, Anne, Jane, and Harriet. The name of the eldest, now Mrs. Richmond Ritchie, who has followed so closely in her father's steps, is a household word to the world of novel readers; the second died as a child; the younger lived to marry Leslie Stephen, who is too well known for me to say more than that he wrote, the other day, the little volume on Dr. Johnson in this series; but she, too, has now followed her father. Of Thackeray's married life what need be said shall be contained in a very few words. It was grievously unhappy; but the misery

> of it came from God, and was in no wise due to human fault. She became ill, and her mind failed her. There was a period during which he would not believe that her illness was more than illness, and then he clung to her and waited on her with an assiduity of affection which only made his task the more painful to him. At last it became evident that she should live in the companionship of some one with whom her life might be altogether quiet, and she had since been domiciled with a lady with whom she has been happy. Thus she was, after but a few years of married life, taken away from him, and he became as it were a widower till the end of his days.[55]

Trollope, probably aware of the scandal that the fallacious dates would have caused, silently omitted the birth years of the three children. The bulky second sentence is a typical Trollopian comment on the factual data supplied by his sources; there is no question of its coming ultimately from anywhere but Trollope's personal experience. The remainder of the paragraph, on the other hand, presents material that Trollope would of necessity have learned from some member of the family, possibly from Lady Ritchie herself. Doubtless Thackeray would not have added the touches of his own affection or the euphemistic description of a feminine companion if he had told the story to Trollope, neither would Trollope have been so delicate here, when he is later tactless enough to refer to Mrs. Thackeray's malady as "a skeleton in [the] cupboard,"[56] unless he heard the story told in those terms. He may have heard it from one of Thackeray's old friends at the Garrick Club, but they would not have added these touches. If Lady Ritchie was the source, she did not need to relate it specifically for the purposes of the volume; therefore, Trollope may well have learned

it before the book materialized even as a faint possibility and, remembering it when he was writing, inserted it here. Two other passages that had to derive from the same ultimate source are the relation of Thackeray's revulsion of biography and his orders forbidding one of himself[57] and the account of Thackeray and his mother that is sandwiched between the information taken from the second question and George Venables's letter:

> All who knew William Makepeace remember his mother well, a handsome, spare, gray-haired lady, whom Thackeray treated with a courtly deference as well as constant affection. There was, however, something of discrepancy between them as to matters of religion. Mrs. Carmichael Smyth was disposed to the somewhat austere observance of the evangelical section of the Church. Such, certainly, never became the case with her son. There was disagreement on the subject, and probably unhappiness at intervals, but never, I think, quarrelling. Thackeray's house was his mother's home whenever she pleased it, and the home also of his stepfather.[58]

Except for questions twenty-one and twenty-two, the remaining questions concern bibliographical, not biographical, information and are not pertinent to this study. Question twenty-one concerned the inheritance Thackeray left to his daughters:

> 21. He told me shortly before his death that he was worth then exactly the sum of money that he inherited on coming of age— He mentioned a sum—I think it was £30,000.
>
> — Ans. He left about £730 a year including 5000 for the copyrights after all dues & taxes were paid.

This information is the basis of the following paragraph in which Trollope joins his question and Lady Ritchie's answer:

> A little before his death Thackeray told me that he had then succeeded in replacing the fortune which he had lost as a young man. He had, in fact, done better, for he left an income of seven hundred and fifty pounds behind him.[59]

The combination of information that he personally knew and that Lady Ritchie offered to him again reveals the mosaic effect of the finished work; Trollope seems to have known only rather broad generalities, the details being filled in from other sources. Whereas he joined reliable information in this case, he joined the information to hypothesis when he used question twenty-two. His question reveals his knowledge of Thackeray's physical condition in the 1860's, while Lady Ritchie's answer reveals her ignorance of the exact time, actually before her birth, that Thackeray began suffering.

> 22. For some years before his death he was a sufferer When did that begin.
>
> -- Ans. He had a dreadful fever while he was writing Pendennis. At Rome he was again ill & ever afterwards suffered from spasms & constant pain & uneasiness--

I have quoted the corresponding paragraph at length and numbered each sentence so that the development of one of the small divisions, typical of Thackeray, can be more carefully analyzed; by seeing the structure of Trollope's thought in this passage, the larger movements in the book, those of considerable length, will be clearer. Earlier we saw how Trollope combined several answers to form a rather incoherent sequence; here we can perceive the same incoherence as Trollope weaves his source material into his own analysis.

(1) This ought to have been the happiest period of his life, and should have been very happy. (2) He had become fairly easy in his circumstances. (3) He had succeeded in his work, and had made for himself a great name. (4) He was fond of popularity, and especially anxious to be loved by a small circle of friends. (5) These good things he had thoroughly achieved. (6) Immediately after the publication of Vanity Fair he stood high among the literary heroes of his country, and had endeared himself especially to a special knot of friends. (7) His face and figure, his six feet four in height, with his flowing hair, already nearly gray, and his broken nose, his broad forehead and ample chest, encountered everywhere either love or respect; and his daughters to him were all the world,—the bairns of whom he says, at the end of the White Squall ballad;

> I thought, as day was breaking,
> My little girls were waking,
> And smiling, and making
> A prayer at home for me.

(8) Nothing could have been more tender or endearing than his relations with his children. (9) But still there was a skeleton in his cupboard,—or rather two skeletons. (10) His home had been broken up by his wife's malady, and his own health was shattered. (11) When he was writing Pendennis, in 1849, he had a severe fever, and then those spasms came, of which four or five years afterwards he wrote to Mr. Reed.[60] (12) His home, as a home should be, was never restored to him,—or his health. (13) Just at that period of life at which a man generally makes a happy exchange in taking his wife's drawing-room in lieu of the smoking-room of his club, and assumes those domestic ways of living which are becoming and pleasant for matured years, that drawing-room and those domestic ways were closed against him. (14) The children were then no more than babies, as far as society was concerned,—things to kiss and play with, and make a home happy if they could only have had their mother with them. (15) I have no doubt there were those who thought that Thackeray was very jolly under his adversity. (16) Jolly he was. (17) It was the manner of the man to be so,—if that continual playfulness which was natural to him, lying over a melancholy which was as continual, be compatible with jollity. (18) He laughed, and ate, and drank, and threw his pearls about with miraculous profusion. (19) But I fancy that he was far from happy. (20) I remember once, when I was young, receiving advice as to the manner in which I had better

> spend my evenings; I was told that I ought to go home, drink tea, and read good books. (21) It was excellent advice, but I found that the reading of good books in solitude was not an occupation congenial to me. (22) It was so, I take it, with Thackeray. (23) He did not like his lonely drawing-room, and went back to his life among the clubs by no means with contentment.[61]

In sentence 1 Trollope stated what should be the central idea of the paragraph, and which does in places hold the structure of the paragraph together. Until sentence 7 he presented the reasons why Thackeray should have been happy, thus fully defining the final phrase of the first sentence. With the ungainly seventh sentence, however, the logical development becomes confused. The unexpectedly detailed physical description of Thackeray purports to define the popularity with the small group of friends mentioned in sentences 4 and 6 so that the logical link is the expansion from the "special knot of friends" to the more embracing phraseology of "everywhere either love or respect"; nevertheless, the physical description becomes so syntactically awkward that grammatical relation is altogether lost. The second clause, like sentence 5, employs an inverted order, which unlike the earlier example remains awkward. Apparently this awkwardness is, in part, due to Trollope's wavering, for at this point he digressed from the logical sequence developed through the first six sentences. He inserted the quotation, and then in sentence 8 he makes a statement, totally unrelated, concerning Thackeray's relation to his children. With the strong conjunction "But still" in sentence 9, Trollope reverts to the logical sequence of sentences 1 through 6, only now he presented the negative side or those

situations that prevented Thackeray's happiness. The introduction of this side is blunt and, perhaps, lacks proper taste following the statement of the eighth sentence. He inserted the information from Lady Ritchie in sentence 11, a sentence that logically follows the final clause of 10, but in the next he again breaks his fluidity by inserting a thought that refers back to sentence 8. This discussion of Thackeray's home life seems pulled into the sequence, even though it adds to the negative circumstances, because Trollope is slowly forgetting his original logical sequence and is moving into a new thought; therefore, it presents the contradiction to sentence 8 that Thackeray, while being "tender or endearing" to his daughters, found no pleasure in his home life and sought refuge at his clubs. Obviously Trollope does not wish to imply this contradiction, but he in no way resolves it, for he immediately in sentences 15 through 19 reverted to the original pattern of sentences 1 through 6. In fact, the paragraph has a well developed and clearly logical sequence of ideas if sentences 7 through 14, the ones in which he wandered from his subject, were omitted. While there is no reason to suppose that these sentences were inserted into an already developed paragraph, such would appear to be the case, if Trollope had not consistently written in this manner throughout the volume. It is further interesting that two, possibly three, sources are utilized in this central portion; Trollope had difficulty in using the material. He groped for a way to incorporate them and finally, at the expense of his logical development, forced them into his text. The same is true of sentences 20 through 23 in

which he padded the account by relating a personal experience then forced it to apply to his subject by an illogical assumption. The entire paragraph, therefore, is a logical sequence broken by awkward insertions of factual data or personal opinion. In terms of the entire biographical chapter, the same development is noticeable and at time highly confusing. After his introduction, for example, he presented the material concerning Thackeray's parentage and birth but inserted a paragraph of reminiscences of persons who might be related to Thackeray before he mentioned Thackeray's mother; after describing Mrs. Carmichael Smyth, Trollope quoted a letter from Venables concerning Thackeray's life at Charterhouse, mentioned that Thackeray went to Cambridge, and then digressed for almost two pages to speculate about Thackeray's relation to undergraduate publications, Tennyson's Timbuctoo, and snobbery. Almost consistently the writing is crabbed and stiff when he employs details gathered from the various sources but fluid when he is writing either from personal opinion or placing value judgments on the factual details. The result of this stylistic feature was to overemphasize his own insertions. When he described Thackeray's style in Barry Lyndon in a later passage in the volume, Trollope himself accounted for the difference between the stiff and the fluid passages in his own writing:

> As one reads, one sometimes is struck by a conviction that this or the other writer has thoroughly liked the work on which he is engaged. There is a gusto about his passages, a liveliness in the language, a spring in the motion of the words, an eagerness of description, a lilt, if I may

> so call it, in the progress of the narrative, which makes the reader feel that the author has himself greatly enjoyed what he has written. He has evidently gone on with his work without any sense of weariness, or doubt; and the words have come readily to him.[62]

While we have attempted to analyze this quality from a less impressionistic viewpoint, the gusto that Trollope here mentioned is precisely what is lacking in those passages in which he attempted to utilize his sources.

While Lady Ritchie was doubtless not the sole informant, she was the most important. The help from other contributors is more fragmentary and scattered through the biographical chapter; nevertheless, certain passages appear to be dependent upon sources that can be identified with relative accuracy. Other than the letter from George Venables, Trollope himself relates that he was in the possession of certain documents:

> I have had sent to me for my inspection an album of drawings and letters, which, in the course of twenty years, from 1829 to 1849, were despatched from Thackeray to his old friend Edward Fitzgerald.[63]

Because the letters cover the period between 1829 and 1849, none of the information relating to Thackeray's life after 1849 appears to derive from this source. Since 1829 is the date of Thackeray's presence at Cambridge, where he met Fitzgerald, the possibility of Fitzgerald's contributing the information concerning The Snob and The Gownsman is probable. The nature of the paragraph on The Snob further suggests that Trollope was given no more than a broad hint, except for the parody of Tennyson's "Timbuctoo":

> In 1829 a little periodical was brought out at Cambridge, called The Snob, with an assurance on the title that it was not conducted by members of the university. It is presumed that Thackeray took a hand in editing this. He certainly wrote, and published in the little paper, some burlesque lines on the subject which was given for the Chancellor's prize poem of the year. This was Timbuctoo, and Tennyson was the victor on the occasion.[64]

Again Trollope was only told that Thackeray contributed to The Gownsman, because he does not know any definitely attributed articles:

> The Snob lived, I think, but nine weeks, and was followed at an interval, in 1830, by The Gownsman, which lived to the seventeenth number, and at the opening of which Thackeray no doubt had a hand.[65] It professed to be a continuation of The Snob. It contains a dedication to all proctors, which I should not be sorry to attribute to him,
>
> "To all Proctors, past, present, and future--
> Whose taste it is our privilege to follow,
> Whose virtue it is our duty to imitate,
> Whose presence it is our interest to avoid."
>
> There is, however, nothing beyond fancy to induce me to believe that Thackeray was the author of the dedication, and I do not know that there is any evidence to show that he was connected with The Snob beyond the writing of Timbuctoo.[66]

Since Trollope would not have known that Thackeray was connected with these periodicals without help, he may have learned these details from the man whom Thackeray had befriended while at Cambridge. Another case of aid from Fitzgerald that has already been discussed was the information concerning the amount of Thackeray's inheritance and the futile attempt to float The National Standard. While these two sections may have been constructed from information received through other sources, the letters that Fitzgerald loaned to Trollope cover this period; since

Fitzgerald had been an intimate friend during the period between Cambridge and the loss of the inheritance, there is no reason to hypothesize another source for the information.

Further information came, of course, from Thackeray's friends in the Garrick Club whom Trollope interviewed, and two passages in Thackeray can be readily attributed to these people. In the first, Trollope quotes remarks that these friends had heard from Thackeray concerning his work:

> Who else would have told such a story of himself to the first acquaintance he chanced to meet? Of Thackeray it might be predicted that he certainly would do so. No little wound of the kind ever came to him but what he disclosed it at once. "They have only bought so many of my new book." "Have you seen the abuse of my last number?" "What am I to turn my hand to? They are getting tired of my novels." "They don't read it," he said to me of Esmond. "So you don't mean to publish my work?" he said once to a publisher in an open company.

While not of great factual import, these remarks are used by Trollope to interpret Thackeray's personality, particularly his feelings of inferiority; therefore, Trollope uses the information to censure Thackeray for a trait which he himself displayed:

> Other men keep their little troubles to themselves. I have heard even of authors who have declared how all the publishers were running after their books; I have heard some discourse freely of their fourth and fifth editions; I have known an author to boast of his thousands sold in this country, and his tens of thousands in America; but I never heard anyone else declare that no one would read his chef-d'oeuvre, and that the world was becoming tired of him. It was he who said, when he was fifty, that a man past fifty should never write a novel.[67]

The other passage that is definitely dependent on the Garrick Club friends is used for more laudatory purposes until Trollope's final clause of his comment on the information:

> In inquiring about him from those who survive him, and knew him well in those days, I always hear the same account. "If I could only tell you the impromptu lines which fell from him!" "If I had only kept the drawings from his pen, which used to be chucked about as though they were worth nothing!" "If I could only remember the drolleries!" Had they been kept, there might now be many volumes of these sketches, as to which the reviewer says that their talent was "altogether of the Hogarth kind." Could there be any kind more valuable? Like Hogarth, he could always make his picture tell his story; though, unlike Hogarth, he had not learned to draw.[68]

If these passages, however, represent the only information that Trollope gathered from this source, the friends were remarkably sterile in their recollections. Several definitely dependent passages might have been built on information with which these men would have been familiar although there is no indication in the material that allows a positive identification. The most important of these passages are as follows:

(1) The anecdote of Thackeray's being asked to shorten The Great Hoggarty Diamond.[69]
(2) Thackeray's reasons for the selection of the pseudonym, Michael Angelo Titmarsh.[70]
(3) The poem that an informant remembered for forty years before giving it to Trollope.[71]
(4) Thackeray's defence of his lectures in 1857.[72]
(5) Thackeray's unsuccessful application for a position in the Post Office.[73]
(6) Thackeray's unsuccessful stand for Parliament.[74]

Of these six passages only the sixth, which was mentioned by Lady Ritchie, and the fifth, which may have come from Trollope's association

with the Post Office, can be attributed to a source outside the Garrick Club, yet the friends at the Club, where Thackeray spent a great portion of his time, would have been familiar with the details of all six passages. Since Trollope received help from fellow Club members, to ascribe these parts of the biographical chapter to this source is well founded.

A final general source of information that was at Trollope's disposal was material already in print before his writing. Of these the greatest single source was, as is to be expected, Thackeray's own works. While Trollope quotes poems in several places,[75] he also utilizes more extensive passages from Thackeray's prose. Passages from Lovel the Widower are purported to display Thackeray's opinion of the futile newspaper endeavor;[76] a letter to The Morning Chronicle in which Thackeray advocated governmental pensions for writers is sandwiched, rather illogically, between the account of Thackeray's desire to enter the civil service and Trollope's criticism of the procedure of writing used by authors who wrote for serial publication.[77] Trollope's other published sources are quite varied; he used reviews,[78] Macready's Diary,[79] Forster's Life of Dickens,[80] Dickens's "In Memoriam,"[81] and the letters of Thackeray to Mr. Reed, the only private letters of Thackeray then in print.[82] While this list is far from complete, it does help to round out the amount of labor Trollope exerted in gathering information for the sixty-one pages of his biographical chapter. He had admitted to George Smith sixteen years earlier that he did not know enough to write a life of Thackeray, and even in 1879 there

were other people more qualified to write the memoir. The large number of sources again raises the question of why Trollope happened to be selected for the work. Lady Ritchie and Leslie Stephen must have known his familiarity with Thackeray when they agreed to Morley's appeal for permission, but they also would have known that Trollope placed Thackeray's literary achievement above that of any contemporary. The selection, therefore, appears to have come as the result of a misguided concept of Trollope's opinion of Thackeray the man so that when Trollope's opinion was published, they realized for the first time that his opinion of Thackeray's personality was not the same as they had imagined. Perhaps, this realization was in itself shocking enough for their subsequent anger, since one of them had given help, but more probably the manner in which Trollope manipulated his sources was basic to their repulsion.

Having seen Trollope's reliance on his sources, we can more fully understand those parts of the biographical chapter that directly reflect his own opinion of Thackeray's personality. The stylistic differences between the dependent and the original passages clearly reveal, in many cases, Trollope's opinion, and because the original was written with much great fluency, Trollope's opinion causes the factual information to be subordinated in the reader's mind. Earlier we analyzed the obvious difficulty Trollope had when he worked Lady Ritchie's answers to questions six, seven, and ten into his account; this short passage is the opening of a typically Trollopian criticism:

> In 1830 he left Cambridge, and went to Weimar either in that year or in 1831. Between Weimar and Paris he spent some portion of his earlier years, while his family,—his mother, that is, and his stepfather,—were living in Devonshire. It was then the purport of his life to become an artist, and he studied drawing at Paris, affecting especially Bonnington, the young English artist who had himself painted at Paris and who had died in 1828. He never learned to draw,—perhaps never could have learned. That he was idle, and did not do his best, we may take for granted. He was always idle, and only on some occasions, when the spirit moved him thoroughly, did he do his best even in after life. But with drawing,—or rather without it,—he did wonderfully well even when he did his worst. He did illustrate his own books, and everyone knows how incorrect were his delineations. But as illustrations they were excellent. How often have I wished that characters of my own creating might be sketched as faultily, if with the same appreciation of the intended purpose. Let everyone look at the "plates," as they are called in Vanity Fair, and compare each with the scenes and the characters intended to be displayed, and there see whether the artist,—if we may call him so,—has not managed to convey in the picture the exact feeling which he has described in the text.[83]

As soon as he had discarded the factual details, Trollope moves into his own opinion; the illogical and awkward constructions immediately are followed by smooth logical patterns and graceful cadences. Since the discussion of Thackeray's inability to draw and idleness fall within the more fluent section of the paragraph, these elements, not the factual, are emphasized. Because this type of emphasis is frequent in the chapter, that which claims to be biographical is, in effect, Trollope's personal opinion of Thackeray's character pulled into a structure by a few factual details. To see Trollope's opinion of Thackeray is, then, to understand the chapter in its fullest light and to appreciate Trollope's relation to his subject.

Trollope tells his reader early in the chapter, "Something of his manner, something of his appearance I can say, something perhaps of his condition of mind; because for some few years he was known to me."[84] The nature of such an assertion is to cover his statements with the aura of truth and throw the unsuspecting off guard. But the view held by Trollope, as we have already seen in the autobiography, did not allow him to present an image that was either agreeable to the subject's daughter, who saw her father from a more sentimental viewpoint, or accurate to Thackeray's later biographers who could look upon their subject without the blinders of personal antagonism. The relation between the two novelists was not one that led the younger to an unbiased view; therefore, when he attempted to soar to eulogy in the last paragraph of the first chapter, perhaps to please Lady Ritchie, who had offered important help, his choice of words is forced, overdone, and sentimental:

> Such is my idea of the man whom many call a cynic, but whom I regard as one of the most soft-hearted of human beings, sweet as Charity itself, who went about the world dropping pearls, doing good, and never wilfully inflicting a wound.[85]

The absurd comparison of Charity or Christ and Thackeray might have been moving if the earlier portions of the chapter had skillfully or at least consistently led to it as an inevitable conclusion, but to move from Trollope's censures into this kind of figurative language reduces the concluding paragraph to bathos. If Trollope were attempting to present an honestly objective view that weighed Thackeray's good and bad qualities and found him overcoming the bad, the final tribute would be understandable, but Trollope created no such carefully balanced

view. He tells that Thackeray was idle, "had a morbid horror of a snob,"[86] would have disgraced the civil service,[87] and had a tongue that inadvertently insulted.[88] When he has so ardently created such an image of his subject, the sudden reversal is unbelievable and hence unconvincing. The reader is left with a sour taste by the attempt and prefers to accept the more earthly criticism as the true picture of the man.

Because Trollope's view remained colored by his early association with Edmund Yates, the image of Thackeray presented by the volume cannot be called laudatory; nevertheless, Trollope was being, at least in the main, honest in presenting his view, however much it may have differed from that taken by Lady Ritchie or Mr. Ray, each of whom wrote from a peculiar preconception of the subject. If Trollope sees Thackeray as essentially melancholy and crippled with pain and reads this vision into periods of his life when he was neither, he is not attempting to present a perverted view; he is merely attempting to account for behavior that he is unable to comprehend since he did not know Thackeray prior to 1860. But his view of Thackeray is not only colored by his personal prejudices and his lack of perception into Thackeray's character; he also projects his own traits into Thackeray. This quality becomes interesting because Trollope ultimately sets Thackeray beside himself in order to build up his own ego. After he has objectively related Thackeray's futile appeal to Lord Clanricarde in 1843 for the position of Assistant Secretary at the General Post Office, Trollope, who believed himself to have been a "valuable public servant,"[89] commented on Thackeray's fitness for the position:

> It may be said that had Thackeray succeeded in that attempt he would surely have ruined himself. No man can be fit for the management and performance of special work who has learned nothing of it before his thirty-seventh year; and no man could have been less so than Thackeray. There are men who, though they be not fit, are disposed to learn their lesson and make themselves as fit as possible. Such cannot be said to have been the case with this man. For the special duties which he would have been called upon to perform, consisting to a great extent of the maintenance of discipline over a large body of men, training is required, and the service would have suffered for awhile under any untried elderly tiro. Another man might have put himself into hardness. Thackeray never would have done so. The details of his work after the first month would have been inexpressibly wearisome to him. To have gone into the city, and to have remained there every day from eleven till five would have been all but impossible to him. He would not have done it. And then he would have been tormented by the feeling that he was taking the pay and not doing the work.[90]

Whereas this type of projection derived only from Trollope's own mind, the implication is clearly suggested: Trollope was a good public servant, but Thackeray could only have left the civil service with "the memory of a disgraceful job."[91] But the implied contrast of the writer and his subject moves into more personal grounds in this same paragraph. Trollope, who worked during the days for the Post Office and in his spare time as a novelist, had established a system for tabulating his daily work and scorned those writers who, like Thackeray, were not methodical:

> There are those who would be ashamed to subject themselves to such a taskmaster, and who think that the man who works with his imagination should allow himself to wait till—inspiration moves him. When I have heard such doctrine preached, I have hardly been able to repress my scorn. To me it would not be more absurd if the shoemaker were to wait for inspiration, or the tallow-chandler for the divine moment of melting. If the man whose business it is to write has eaten too many good things, or has drunk too much, or smoked too many cigars,—as men who write sometimes will do,—then his condition may be unfavourable for work; but so will be the condition of a shoemaker who has been similarly imprudent. I have sometimes thought that the inspiration wanted has been the remedy which time will give to the evil results of such imprudence.—Mens sana in corpore sano. The author wants that as does every other workman,—that and a habit of industry. I was once told that the surest aid to the writing of a book was a piece of cobbler's wax on my chair. I certainly believe in the cobbler's wax much more than the inspiration.[92]

In his discussion of Thackeray and the civil service, Trollope adds that Thackeray's intention was

> . . . to join literature with the Civil Service. He had been taught to regard the Civil Service as easy, and had counted upon himself as able to add it to his novels, and his work with his Punch brethren, and to his contributions generally to the literature of the day. He might have done so, could he have risen at five, and have sat at his private desk for three hours before he began his official routine at the public one. A capability for grinding, an aptitude for continuous task work, a disposition to sit in one's chair as though fixed to it by cobbler's wax, will enable a man in the prime of life to go through the tedium of a second day's work every day; but of all men Thackeray was the last to bear the wearisome perseverance of such a life.[93]

When Trollope's opinion in the autobiography is brought to bear on this already adverse criticism, we can see that Trollope's impulse to belittle

Thackeray for personal aggrandizement gives additional sting to the biography. If Trollope was a good public servant and was also able to rise to prominence as a novelist, Thackeray, whom he says could not have joined the two professions, was deficient and inferior.

Another section of the biography that reveals a similar impulse on Trollope's part in the account of Thackeray's unsuccessful stand as a liberal candidate for Oxford. In 1868 Trollope had unsuccessfully stood for Beverley in the same interest so that he had experienced a similar defeat.[94] Although it would be expected that Trollope would handle Thackeray's defeat with a measure of sympathy, he uses it as an opportunity to lash Thackeray for even contemplating that he could have been successful if he had won:

> There are, no doubt, many to whom a seat in Parliament comes almost as the birthright of a well-born and well-to-do English gentleman. They go there with no more idea of shining than they do when they are elected to a first-class club;—hardly with more idea of being useful. It is the thing to do, and the House of Commons is the place where a man ought to be—for a certain number of hours. Such men neither succeed nor fail, for nothing is expected of them. From such a one as Thackeray something would have been expected, which would not have been forthcoming. He was too desultory for regular work,—full of thought, but too vague for practical questions. He could not have endured to sit for two or three hours at a time with his hat over his eyes, pretending to listen, as is the duty of a good legislator. He was a man intolerant of tedium, and in the best of his time impatient of slow work. Nor, though his liberal feelings were very strong, were his political convictions definite or accurate. He was a man who mentally drank in much, feeding his fancy hourly with what he saw, what he heard, what he read, and

> then pouring it all out with an immense power of amplification. But it would have been impossible for him to study and bring home to himself the various points of a complicated bill with a hundred and fifty clauses. In becoming a man of letters, and taking that branch of letters which fell to him, he obtained the special place that was fitted for him. He was a round peg in a round hole. There was no other hole which he would have fitted nearly so well. But he had his moment of political ambition, like others,—and paid a thousand pounds for his attempt.[95]

If Trollope had not thought himself qualified to sit in Parliament, he would not have campaigned, but he belittles Thackeray by asserting that he was not fit for the position. This type of adverse criticism is the same that we saw in the autobiography in his opinion of Thackeray as an editor and of Thackeray's procedure in writing, both of which are discussed in the biography; therefore, the generalization that Trollope was belittling his subject in order (partly unconsciously) to put himself in the more superior position is based on one trend in the volume. Trollope's reasons for this inversion are many; he obviously had been deeply hurt by Thackeray's affront in January, 1860, and in a mind that was already worried by feelings of inferiority, the obviously superior position of his rival must have rankled. To elevate himself at the expense of a man who had been dead for sixteen years might have been morbid, but no one was harmed, except perhaps Lady Ritchie's memory of her father, and the writer had in his own mind established his own superiority. While this desire is basic to the inversion that has been discussed, we should be careful not to make Trollope malicious in the treatment of Thackeray; that malice or the overt desire to harm

was present, as in the case of Yates's autobiography, is hardly the case. Trollope was probably trying to be fully fair, even though in his fairness he saw himself as the superior, not Thackeray.

In other passages in Thackeray, Trollope attempts to present the psychological motivation behind his subject's behavior. After he has mentioned Fraser's request that Thackeray shorten The Great Hoggarty Diamond, Trollope digresses into the following account of Thackeray's personality:

> I can understand all the disquietude of his heart when that warning, as to the too great length of his story, was given to him. He was not a man capable of feeling at any time quite assured in his position, and when that occurred he was very far from assurance. I think that at no time did he doubt the sufficiency of his own mental qualification for the work he had taken in hand; but he doubted all else. He doubted the appreciation of the world; he doubted his fitness for turning his intellect to valuable account; he doubted his physical capacity,—dreading his own lack of industry; he doubted his luck; he doubted the continual absence of some of those misfortunes on which the works of literary men are shipwrecked. Though he was aware of his own power, he always to the last, was afraid that his own deficiencies should be too strong against him. It was his nature to be idle,—to put off his work,—and then to be angry with himself for putting it off.[96]

Here Trollope seems more to have analyzed the motives that forced him to write three novels a year while working at the Post Office, the desire to be idle that led to the guilty feeling that created his notebook and the sense of inferiority that had hurt him so deeply when Thackeray snubbed him or when Scudamore was advanced over his head. The passionate syntactical arrangement suggests the depth of feeling

Trollope exerted on these lines and, perhaps, even the self-identification that brings his own personality into prominence. This type of self-identification, joined with Trollope's belief that Thackeray's humor and wit were a veneer to conceal a melancholic nature, tends to make Thackeray almost pathetic:

> "I have got to make it shorter!" Then he would put his hands in his pockets, and stretch himself, and straighten the lines of his face, over which a smile would come, as though this intimation from his editor were the best joke in the world; and he would walk away, with his heart bleeding, and every nerve in an agony.[97]

Furthermore, when Trollope adds to the melancholy his misconception that Thackeray had been suffering from poor health through the majority of his life, the pathetic is almost deepened, except that Trollope places the blame for much of the melancholy on faulty writing procedures. In the following passage, for example, he begins with the criticism of writing in number, rendered trite by the quotation from Pope, and moves to the mention of Thackeray's health in such a manner that the censure of the first seven sentences is hardly eliminated by the bulky eighth:

> Esmond was brought out as a whole. The other appeared in numbers. "He lisped in numbers, for the numbers came." It is a mode of pronunciation in literature by no means very articulate, but easy of production and lucrative. But though easy it is seductive, and leads to idleness. An author by means of it can raise money and reputation on his book before he has written it, and when the pang of parturition is over in regard to one part, he feels himself entitled to a period of ease because the amount required for the next division will occupy him only half the month. This to Thackeray was so alluring that the entirety of the final half was not always

> given to the task. His self reproaches and bemoanings when sometimes the day for reappearing would come terribly nigh, while yet the necessary amount of copy was far from being ready, were often very ludicrous and very sad;—ludicrous because he never told of his distress without adding to it something of ridicule which was irresistible, and sad because those who loved him best were aware that physical suffering had already fallen upon him, and that he was deterred by illness from the exercise of continuous energy.[98]

While the pathetic tone that was apparent in the passages in which Trollope attempted to probe Thackeray's mind but, in reality, was identifying himself with his subject is more poignant, the sympathy for Thackeray is consistently qualified by placing contingent blames upon him, as his poor procedure for writing in this case. Another case of this mixture of sympathy and censure is in the part describing Thackeray's death. Trollope concludes his discussion of Thackeray's work on the Cornhill, "A man so susceptible, so prone to work by fits and starts, so unmethodical, could not have been a good editor," before he mentions Thackeray's move to Palace Green. The next paragraph begins, "In 1863 he died in the house which he had built, . . ." but he does not return to this thought until the second paragraph later which opens, "He died on the day before Christmas, as has been said above. . . ."[99] Between these two mentions of Thackeray's death, Trollope advises the beginning novelist to complete his work prior to the publication of any part, using Thackeray, Mrs. Gaskell, and Dickens as unfavorable examples, and inserts the following paragraph:

> With the last chapter of Denis Duval was published in the magazine a set of notes on the books, taken for the most part from Thackeray's own papers, and showing how much collateral work he had given to the fabrication of his novel. No doubt in preparing other tales, especially Esmond, a very large amount of such collateral labour was found necessary. He was a man who did very much of such work, delighting to deal in little historical incidents. They will be found in almost everything that he did, and I do not know that he was ever accused of gross mistakes. But I doubt whether on that account he should be called a laborious man. He could go down to Winchelsea, when writing about the little town, to see in which way the streets lay, and to provide himself with what we call local colouring. He could jot down the suggestions, as they came to his mind, of his future story. There was an irregularity in such work which was to his taste. His very notes would be delightful to read, partaking of the nature of pearls when prepared only for his own use. But he could not bring himself to sit at his desk and do an allotted task day after day. He accomplished what must be considered as quite a sufficient life's work. He had about twenty-five years for the purpose, and that which he has left is an ample produce for the time. Nevertheless he was a man of fits and starts, who, not having been in his early years drilled to method, never achieved it in his career.[100]

By interrupting the train of thought (Thackeray's death) to make a criticism of this caliber, Trollope's sympathy for Thackeray becomes qualified by his reservations. The result is the unnatural wavering from sympathy, or sorrow in the case of the death, to censure, a wavering between two poles that can be explained only by assuming that the one was the view held by Trollope and evident in the autobiography while the other was added for Lady Ritchie's sake since she had helped

him in compiling the factual data. That he was unsuccessful in holding the volume together with such a split purpose was only natural, for the reader is never sure when Trollope is going to swing to the opposite pole with no warning.

When Trollope compares Thackeray and Dickens, his opinion of Thackeray becomes most clearly obvious, because if the followers of the two great rivals divided into opposing camps, Trollope favors the camp aligned to Dickens. In this respect, the volume presents a prominent influence of the Yates-Collins-Forster group, an influence strong enough in Trollope's mind to lower Thackeray beneath Dickens in the comparisons. The first mention of Dickens occurs immediately after Trollope has condemned Thackeray's artistic abilities:

> Dickens has informed us that he first met Thackeray in 1835, on which occasion the young artist aspirant, looking no doubt after profitable employment, "proposed to become the illustrator of my earliest book." It is singular that such should have been the first interview between the two great novelists. We may presume that the offer was rejected.[101]

Here the final sentence suggests that Thackeray's drawing was so inferior that Dickens had no other choice than to reject the offer; although Trollope might disvalue Thackeray's ability to draw, to place the same disvaluing into Dickens is to establish a relation between the rivals that becomes detrimental to Thackeray. If Trollope's insinuation in this passage appears to be too submerged, his open comparison of the two novelists a few pages later is completely surface. Trollope here begins by comparing their literary positions in 1837-1838:

> Pickwick had been published, and Oliver Twist and Nicholas Nickleby were being published. All the world was talking about the young author who was assuming his position with a confidence in his own powers which was fully justified both by his present and future success. It was manifest that he could make, not only his own fortune, but that of his publishers, and that he was a literary hero bound to be worshipped by all literary grades of men, down to the "devils" of the printing-office. At that time, Thackeray, the older man, was still doubting, still hesitating, still struggling. Everyone then had accepted the name of Charles Dickens. That of William Thackeray was hardly known beyond the circle of those who are careful to make themselves acquainted with such matters.[102]

He proceeds in the next paragraph to turn this difference into a problem, avowing that he will not make a comparison between their genius:

> They had begun to make their effort much at the same time; and if there was any advantage in point of position as they commenced, it was with Thackeray. It might be said that the genius of the one was brighter than that of the other, or, at any rate, that it was more precocious. But after-judgment has, I think, not declared either of the suggestions to be true. I will make no comparison between two such rivals, who were so distinctly different from each, and each of whom, within so very short a period, has come to stand on a pedestal so high,—the two exalted to so equal a vocation. And if Dickens showed the best of his power early in life, so did Thackeray the best of his intellect. In no display of mental force did he rise above Barry Lyndon.

At the end of the paragraph, Trollope finally states the problem: "Why was Dickens already a great man when Thackeray was still a literary Bohemian?"[103] Even though his solution does not extensively compare "genius," or the manner in which each man saw reality and treated it in his literary works, it does level a sharp blow at Thackeray's character by the application of Trollope's personal and impressionistic

reading of their works. The charges that are brought against Thackeray are neatly balanced by the praises for Dickens; therefore, Thackeray's character becomes inferior.

> The answer is to be found not in the extent or in the nature of the genius of either man, but in the condition of mind,--which indeed may be read plainly in their works by those who have eyes to see. The one was steadfast, industrious, full of purpose, never doubting of himself, always putting his best foot foremost and standing firmly on it when he got it there; with no inward trepidation, with no moments in which he was half inclined to think that this race was not for his winning, this goal not to be reached by his struggles. The sympathy of friends was good to him, but he could have done without it. The good opinion which he had of himself was never shaken by adverse criticism; and the criticism on the other side, by which it was exalted, came from the enumeration of the number of copies sold. He was a firm reliant man, very little prone to change, who, when he had discovered the nature of his own talent, knew how to do the very best with it.
>
> It may almost be said that Thackeray was the very opposite of this. Unsteadfast, idle, changeable of purpose, aware of his own intellect but not trusting it, no man ever failed more generally than he to put his best foot foremost. Full as his works are of pathos, full of humour, full of love and charity, tending, as they always do, to truth and manly worth and womanly modesty, excelling, as they seem to me to do, most other written precepts that I know, they always seem to lack something that might have been there. There is a touch of vagueness which indicates that his pen was not firm while he was using it. He seems to me to have been dreaming ever of some high flight, and then to have told himself, with a half-broken heart, that it was beyond his power to soar up into those bright regions. I can fancy as the sheets went from him every day he told himself, in regard to every sheet, that it was a failure. Dickens was quite sure of his sheets.[104]

Much later in the volume Trollope's prejudice is again sharply outlined; when he discusses Thackeray's lectures, he inserts the following passage:

> I myself never heard him lecture, and can therefore give no opinion of the performance. That which I have heard from others has been very various. It is, I think, certain that he had none of those wonderful gifts of elocution which made it a pleasure to listen to Dickens, whatever he read or whatever he said; nor had he that power of application by using which his rival taught himself with accuracy the exact effect to be given to every word. The rendering of a piece by Dickens was composed as an oratorio is composed, and was then studied by heart as music is studied. And the piece was all given by memory, without any looking at the notes or words. There was nothing of this with Thackeray. But the thing read was in itself of great interest to educated people. The words were given clearly, with sufficient intonation for easy understanding, so that they who were willing to hear something from him on hearing that they had received full value for their money. At any rate, the lectures were successful. The money was made,—and was kept.[105]

Since he never heard Thackeray lecture, Trollope is hardly in the position to disvalue him in this manner. The only explanation for this comparison, then, is his prejudice against Thackeray. He tells that others told him about the lectures; thus if the comparison came from a source other than Trollope, that source could not have been any more favorable to Thackeray than Trollope was to add it to his account. Since Thackeray, in each of these cases, appears definitely inferior to Dickens, the assumption that Trollope was firmly in the former's camp is misleading. Indeed, Trollope firmly places Thackeray's literary achievement above Dickens in the autobiography, but to recognize a man's

achievement as better than others is not to be a "close friend" to the first man. Trollope distinguished between his appreciation of Sir Rowland as a public servant and his dislike for the man without feeling himself self-contradictory, and the same double perception is apparent in this treatment of Thackeray. In this sense, Trollope's opinion of Thackeray remained similar, though probably not as strong, to Yates's, for on May 25, 1839, Yates held the view that Trollope is creating in Thackeray (with added bitterness, of course):

> Throughout all these 30 years, Thackeray, as author, has had no more devoted worshipper: even now, I w[illegible] go through a stiff examination paper, with innumerable quotations from his works: do your paper without any reading Vanity Fair, Pendennis, The Newcomes: & constantly dipping into the Miscellanies & the Ballads. But for Thackeray, the man, I shall think, & say, to my dying day, that his treatment of me was one of the wickedest, cruellest, & most damnable acts of tyranny ever perpetrated.[106]

With Trollope's view of Thackeray clearly before us, the only feasible position that can be held concerning the biographical chapter is one that accounts for the pejorative passages without eliminating Trollope's dependence upon Lady Ritchie, Edward Fitzgerald, and Thackeray's Garrick Club friends. To assume that they gave information fully knowing Trollope's opinion is absurd, while to assume that Trollope maliciously gathered information knowing as he did that he would belittle his subject is to cast an unnecessary slur on his purposes and his character, because in all likelihood Trollope was being fully honest to his informer and to himself. This leaves us with the most reasonable conclusion. Trollope obviously admired certain of

Thackeray's works but had found his association with the man to be insulting to his own dignity. While we cannot censure Thackeray for ill health during his last four years, we can attribute his insult to Trollope at the Cornhill dinner, his reluctance to correspond over the rejected story, and his general loftiness from the younger man to his poor health. That Trollope was unable or unwilling to penetrate beneath the surface created by the ill health reveals, if anything, his lack of perception into Thackeray's character, a lack of perception that led him to fortify the antagonism that he learned from Yates and the publicity of the Garrick Club Affair prior to meeting Thackeray. Although the relation between the two men appears to have been moving to a greater intimacy, Thackeray's death prevented the development that would have eventually given Trollope the needed insight into Thackeray's character. When he was commissioned to write the English Men of Letters volume, he thought that he was writing a work of love, but such a lofty aspiration was only true of his treatment of Thackeray's literary achievement. He had difficulty with the first chapter because he knew that his view differed radically from Lady Ritchie's, but rather than present a view with which he did not sympathize, he delivered his own opinion, slightly softened from the autobiography since he would be responsible for it. Thackeray, therefore, is a biographical account written by a man who greatly admired his subject's works while caring little for the subject himself.

Notes

[1]Noel Gilroy Annan, Leslie Stephen: His Thought and Character in Relation to his Time (London, 1951), p. 63

[2]Hester Thackeray Ritchie, p. 137.

[3]She married a distant cousin, Sir Richmond Ritchie in 1877.

[4]Hester Thackeray Ritchie, p. 252.

[5]Trollope Letters, p. 316.

[6]Ibid., p. 323.

[7]Ibid., p. 346.

[8]Ibid., p. 353.

[9]Ibid., p. 355.

[10]Autobiography, p. 196.

[11]Adversity, p. 2.

[12]Ritchie, "Thackeray and his Biographers," p. 811.

[13]Adversity, p. 3.

[14]Anne Thackeray Ritchie, "Note to Sir Leslie Stephen's 'Life of W. M. Thackeray,'" The Biographical Edition of the Works of William Makepeace Thackeray (London, 1898-1899), XIII, 688.

[15]Leslie Stephen, "Life of W. M. Thackeray," The Biographical Edition of the Works of William Makepeace Thackeray (London, 1898-1899), XIII, 689.

[16]Only the first chapter of the volume is an attempt to write a life; the remainder is a critical review of Thackeray's works.

[17]Thackeray, pp. 2-3.

[18]Ritchie, "Thackeray and his Biographers," p. 811.

[19]John Morley, Recollections (New York, 1917), I, 92.

[20]Trollope Letters, pp. 410-411.

[21]Ibid., p. 412.

[22]Adversity, pp. 2-3.

[23]William Aldis Wright (ed.), More Letters of Edward Fitzgerald (London, 1901), p. 261.

[24]Annan, pp. 63-64.

[25]Adversity, pp. 436-437, fn.4.

[26]Trollope Letters, p. 413.

[27]The original document is in the Bodleian Library among the Trollope Papers II. MS. Don. C. 9, 10, 10*.

[28]Sadleir, p. 351.

[29]See his letter to John Blackwood quoted above.

[30]Walpole, pp. 156-157.

[31]All material quoted from the questionnaire preserves the spelling and punctuation of the original. The question marks enclosed in brackets indicate illegible words. The original document is in the Bodleian Library among the Trollope Papers II. MS. Don. C. 10. f. 72,73.

[32]Thackeray, p. 7.

[33]Ibid., p. 31.

[34]The New York Times for October 29, 1855, for example, mentioned that "Mr. THACKERAY was born in India in the year 1811. . . ."

[35]Thackeray, p. 3.

[36]Ibid., pp. 3-4.

[37]Ibid., pp. 4-5.

[38]Ibid., p. 5.

[39]Ibid., p. 6.

[40]Adversity, p. 129.

[41]Ibid., p. 127.

[42]Thackeray, p. 7.

[43]Adversity, p. 115.

[44]Ibid., p. 122.

[45]Actually he went there in the autumn of 1830 and remained until March, 1831. Ibid., pp. 140-147.

[46]Again The New York Times for October 29, 1855, helped to spread this: "He lost his whole fortune on a run of ill-luck at scarte, but that was nothing particular."

[47]Thackeray, p. 8.

[48]Adversity, p. 162.

[49]This sentence is one of few honestly commendatory ones in the book; that it should be so is not unusual, for Trollope's view of Thackeray was many sided. This is but one part of his opinion of Thackeray's personality.

[50]Thackeray, p. 41.

[51]Ibid., p. 33.

[52]Ritchie, "Biographical Introductions," IV, xx.

[53]Adversity, p. 187.

[54]Ibid., p. 202.

[55]Thackeray, pp. 20-21.

[56]Ibid., p. 40.

[57]Ibid., p. 2.

[58]Ibid., p. 4.

[59]Ibid., p. 59.

[60]In the immediately preceding paragraph Trollope mentioned Mr. Reed and quoted the statement referred to here: "In 1854 he says in one of his letters to Mr. Reed,--the only private letters of his which I know to have been published; 'I am to-day just out of bed after another, about the dozenth, severe fit of spasms which I have had this year. My book would have been written but for them!'" Ibid., p. 39.

[61]Ibid., pp. 39-41.

[62]Ibid., pp. 75-76.

[63] Ibid., p. 30.

[64] Ibid., p. 5.

[65] Actually the seventeen issues of The Gownsman were published between November 5, 1829, and February 25, 1830. Adversity, p. 127.

[66] Thackeray, pp. 6-7.

[67] Ibid., p. 16.

[68] Ibid., p. 30.

[69] Ibid., p. 14.

[70] Ibid., p. 15.

[71] Ibid., p. 32.

[72] Ibid., pp. 47-48.

[73] Ibid., p. 34.

[74] Ibid., p. 48-49.

[75] Ibid., pp. 6, 24, and 40.

[76] Ibid., pp. 9-10.

[77] Ibid., p. 37

[78] Abraham Hayward's review from The Edinburgh Review for 1848 is extensively quoted (ibid., pp. 28-29), and the account of the English reaction to The Four Georges seems to be dependent on newspaper attacks of that time (ibid., pp. 46-47).

[79] Ibid., p. 10, fn.1. Also see p. 27.

[80] Especially ibid., p. 43, although a knowledge of its contents is apparent when he compares Thackeray and Dickens (ibid., pp. 17-20 and 26).

[81] Ibid., p. 8.

[82] Ibid., pp. 36, 39 and 40.

[83] Ibid., p. 7.

[84] Ibid., p. 3.

[85] Ibid., p. 61.

[86] Ibid., p. 6.

[87] Ibid., p. 36.

[88] Ibid., p. 61.

[89] Autobiography, p. 212.

[90] Thackeray, pp. 34-35.

[91] Ibid., p. 36.

[92] Autobiography, p. 100.

[93] Thackeray, pp. 35-36.

[94] See Autobiography, chapter xvi, for a full account of Trollope's campaign.

[95] Thackeray, pp. 48-49.

[96] Ibid., p. 15.

[97] Ibid., p. 20.

[98] Ibid., pp. 38-39.

[99] Ibid., pp. 56-57.

[100] Ibid., p. 57.

[101] Ibid., p. 8.

[102] Ibid., p. 17

[103] Ibid., p. 18.

[104] Ibid., pp. 19-20.

[105] Ibid., pp. 45-46.

[106] Thackeray Letters, IV, 134, fn.17.

EPILOGUE

The volume in the English Men of Letters series did have unique characteristics that separate it from the norm of Victorian biographical writing described by Mr. Garraty in the following paragraph:

> By the forties biography was rapidly descending into complete respectability. An age that invented the verb "to bowdlerize" and considered "leg" an indelicate word could not be expected to excel in biography. "Authorized" and "commemorative" lives proliferated. As they grew duller and more reserved, they also grew longer. The "Life and Letters" variety flourished in two or even three stout volumes--often with dashes substituted for the names of persons still living and "offensive" passages "modified" or entirely removed. (As Charles Dickens once said, many biographies of his day seemed to be written "by somebody who lived next door to the people, rather than inside 'em.") Of course such practices had existed even in the candid eighteenth century, and all Victorians were not so cautious. But in the earlier era the polite biographer was on the defensive; in the later he dominated the field. The poet Tom Moore, writing a biography of Lord Byron, suppressed evidence in Byron's memoirs and then evidently destroyed the source itself lest others less squeamish gain possession of knowledge he considered unfit for human consumption. This happened in 1830; at the height of the era diarists were censoring themselves.[1]

Although Froude's Carlyle (1882-1884) is usually given credit for breaking the trends of the nineteenth century reticence, Trollope's volume preceding it by three years foreshadowed Froude's approach.

> Froude had to choose between the alternative of giving a truthful and as such a disagreeable representation of Carlyle, and that of writing no biography at all. He chose the former alternative, and a yell of dismay arose from the Victorians.[2]

But if Froude and Trollope each presented their subject as they saw him, Trollope far surpassed his rival biographer by incorporating into the work characteristics that were to become obvious in the twentieth century.

These characteristics may be summarized under three headings: (1) the volume was an influence, both directly and indirectly, upon the image of Thackeray presented to the public and led eventually to the writing of a biography that completely disregarded his last wishes; (2) the viewpoint of the author, the separation or division of the subject into personality and artist, caused a split in the volume that ultimately places the book closer to the twentieth century tendency to separate criticism and biography than to the earlier tendency to integrate the two in the biography; and (3) the presentation of the author through the subjective projection into his subject was to link the book to the twentieth century attempt to analyze the mind of a literary man by a projection of the critic's own personality or prejudices into the works left by that writer. With these characteristics in mind, we shall see that even though the volume did not reach a second edition until 1891, its importance remains high as a work that foreshadows tendencies that had not yet colored biographical writing. While we might be wrong to ascribe to it an importance utterly unrelated to its circulation, we can view it as a work that stands at

a pivotal point in the development of biographical writing and as such reflects the development of the genre so clearly that it gains an importance otherwise lacking.

Thackeray's family, represented by Lady Ritchie and Leslie Stephen, did not fail to see what Trollope had done in the biography, and the immediate result was the severing of whatever ties had held them to Trollope. This immediate reaction led to the denial of any aid given to the writer, thus accounting for the widely spread misconception that Trollope received no substantial aid from Lady Ritchie or Edward Fitzgerald.[3] But this reaction only served, during the next two decades, to make an authorized biography more necessary; while the family reacted by greater silence, Thackeray's old enemies, particularly Disraeli in Endymion (1880) and Yates in Recollections and Experiences (1884), used the biography as an excuse to renew their attacks. The entrance of Lady Ritchie as the official biographer of her father in the late 1890's came as a result of these attacks; therefore, her sanctioning of the biography was the direct action that broke Thackeray's wish that there be no life written of him. That Lady Ritchie resented Trollope's portrayal of her father was apparent to him when he saw her at Smith's in February, 1882; in a postscript to a letter to his wife Trollope wrote:

> I dined at Smith's last night and met Annie Thackeray, & we smiled at each other, and we had a thorough good talk. I am very glad because my memory of her father was wounded by the feeling of a quarrel.[4]

As late as 1891, Lady Ritchie, still claiming that whatever the public needed to know about her father could be found in his works, added:

> Mr. Trollope, that kind old friend who knew him so much, saw him from a very different point of view from mine, but he writes with an affection which never varied, and which was ever constant to my father's children, though not untried, I fear, by the present writer.[5]

Between 1882 and 1891, Trollope had died and enough hostile material had been circulated for her to see in Trollope's book the meager praise that was before submerged beneath the overt portrait.

Trollope's image of Thackeray presents a writer who at his best was inferior to none but whose personality was marked by indolence, melancholy, ineptitude, and a morbid awareness of snobbery. Thackeray's family would, of course, not condone such a portrait, so Lady Ritchie alters the portrait by leaving the critical view untouched and by concentrating on her father's personality; therefore, in the "Biographical Introductions" and in Mr. Ray's biography which was influenced by her, we receive a portrait of a benevolent, magnanimous, warm hearted, and sincere man burdened by pain and continued suffering but always rising above his adversity. The enemies, on the other hand, usually accepted Trollope's description of Thackeray's personality (with greater exaggerations) and lowered the appreciation of his artistic skill until he was noticeably below Dickens. Since Trollope, the first biographer, presented the most central view, his portrayal takes on the unusual attribute of furthering both extremes. Lady Ritchie could indirectly use it as a sanction for her own work, and the attackers, who saw that

the "book can hardly be called the offering of a hero-worshipper at the shrine of his saint,"[6] could directly use it as a spring board from their own portrayals.

It is precisely this ambivalence in Trollope's account that puts it also on the border line between criticism and biography; the major bulk of the volume is critical rather than strictly biographical as is the case with many of the volumes in the series. The result of such a balance is that it can be approached from either angle. Edward Mason, who included selections from Thackeray in his Personal Traits of British Authors, aptly described the volume:

> Mr. Trollope's volume in the "English Men of Letters" series—chiefly a literary review—is the nearest approach yet made to a biography of Thackeray.[7]

While the standard Victorian biography of a literary man (for example, Forster's Dickens) is a bulky integration of critical examination and biographical narration, Trollope's leans more to the critical side. There is no more attempt to make the personality of the subject real to the reader than to maintain a close adherence to the truth. While earlier biography may have employed letters, diaries, or the works of the subject to cast light on the personality, Trollope presented the biographical primarily to elucidate the works:

> In this preliminary chapter I will give such incidents and anecdotes of his life as will tell the reader perhaps all about him that a reader is entitled to ask.[8]

This difference in emphasis helps to distinguish the gulf between criticism and biography that has grown since the 1880's. In the light of the standard Victorian life, this places the small volume on a

shelf of its own. Trollope is not seeking to praise the man to please the family; instead he is contrasting the man and the artist in order to show the superiority of the latter at the expense of the former. The demands of length placed upon him by his editor prevented the writing of a bulky volume, another characteristic of the Victorian biographers. This need to condense, joined with his opinion of Thackeray, gives Trollope's book greater affinity to Lytton Strachey's Eminent Victorians (1918) than to Forster's Dickens. If Trollope consistently foreshadowed Strachey, as he apparently did from our study of the text, the emphasis on criticism rather than biography might result from his unwillingness to say too much about his subject lest the family be too greatly embittered. Because he had received help from Lady Ritchie and because he was still honest to himself, if not to fact, he followed what might be called "the most tactful" path. This path allowed him the freedom to present the biographical and the critical as he saw them, without unnecessary twisting of the one to fit the other. The growth of the gulf between criticism and biography, fostered by the New Critics, is, in part, an outgrowth of the development in biographical writing exemplified by Trollope--the unwillingness to flatter when the author did not think flattery was due. While Strachey and the debunkers were able to belittle their subjects, they were not dependent upon information given by the subject's family; Trollope was, so he places his emphasis on criticism.

Finally, Thackeray is unique because it presents the author by projecting his personality into the subject. Trollope was obviously not the first biographer to color his subject in this manner; Izaak Walton did the same two hundred years before. Harold Nicolson described this seventeenth century biographer:

> Where Walton fails is in truth: he fails to present us with complete or even probable portraits; the intrusion of his own feelings and predilections is too apparent; he is too confident of his own ethical values; he surrenders too readily to the deductive method. For Walton, as we know, was actually obsessed by the fascination of doing nothing. He was interested only in those sides of character which reflected his own negative and receptive temperament. His bias is always in favour of calm and caution and devout scholarship, of the "grave behaviour" which he calls "a divine charm." And thus, in dealing with a singularly mundane diplomatist like Wotton, or with a tortured sensualist like Donne, Walton very flagrantly misleads.[9]

But Trollope goes a step further. He not only emphasized traits in Thackeray that he saw in himself; he presented Thackeray as a negative shading to the portrait of himself in the autobiography. While this might be the grossest type of propaganda, the positive traits of Trollope and the negative ones of Thackeray easily fall into a chart:

Trollope (Autobiography)	Thackeray (Thackeray)
1. Industrious	1. Indolent
2. Superior Civil Servant	2. Could only have disgraced the Civil Service
3. Practical common sense	3. Morbid horror of snobbery
4. Methodical	4. Haphazard
5. Superb working habits	5. No set working habits
6. Hardships of unhappy childhood overcome by diligence	6. Easy childhood wasted by instability in youth
7. Happy domestic life	7. Unhappy domestic life
8. Good conversationalist	8. Poor speaker and conversationalist
9. Lost election because firm to principles	9. Lost election because of lack of principles
10. Good editor	10. Bad editor

In each case we might say that Trollope was attempting to understand his subject by a projection of his own personality into Thackeray; this explanation, however, crumbles when we see that Trollope is consistently showing us what a person who lacks his own personality, or who possesses only negative traits, would be. This forcing of the subject into a preconceived construction, while being of immense aid to the propagandist, is bad in biography, for it obscures the truth for secondary considerations. When Freud writes a life of Leonardo da Vinci by applying pre-conceived ideas to the sparse data or when a political party orders a biography of the man supported by its opponent party, the result is propaganda; in the same manner, Trollope, who has turned the picture of Thackeray to represent negative traits that by contrast illuminate his own personality, has written an "impure" biography.[10] The characteristic of his propaganda, that causes the book to look foreward to Strachey and the debunkers as well as to the Freudian School of Criticism, is the obvious purposefulness of the portrayal; in no way can we attribute the final portrait of Thackeray to accident or even to a lack of materials. Trollope had a certain opinion of Thackeray; he did not waver from that opinion when he associated with Thackeray; and after Thackeray's death the opinion remained much the same as it had been prior to the meeting of the two men. Strachey's cynicism and contempt for hero-worship, the debunkers' desire to undermine the reputations of great men, and the Freudians' attempt to psychoanalyze their subjects are foreshadowed in Trollope's contempt for Thackeray's awareness of snobs and his abilities as a speaker or as a potential Civil Servant, in Trollope's attempt to belittle the

character of his subject by emphasizing his indolence and haphazardness, and in Trollope's attempt to enter the mind of his subject by asserting that he was constantly melancholy by creating a face for the world.

With this we have come back to our starting place in this study, Trollope's image of Thackeray was apparently formed in the years prior to their meeting. That this image was received from Edmund Yates, who was in a position to know each man, means that Trollope's first conception of Thackeray the man must have been similar to the portrait of the biography. The fight between Yates and Thackeray at a time when Trollope knew Yates but not Thackeray and at a time that Trollope's only information about Thackeray would have come from newspapers antagonistic to him pushed Trollope closer to Yates's opinion. Yates idolized the artist, placing Pendennis at the top of the literary ladder, while he thought that Thackeray's personality was despicable. Since this is the same conception that Trollope obviously holds in the autobiography and in the biography, the influence of Yates must have been deep. The relations of Trollope and Thackeray were such that Trollope's opinion was more firmly established, although in his adoration of the literary abilities of his rival the contemporaries mistook a friendship with the man. The desire of Trollope to build up his own character at the expense of Thackeray's came as a result of his sudden rise immediately after Thackeray's death; when he rose into the positions left open by the death, he was dependent upon the man whom he did not like. By twisting the image of Thackeray to illustrate the negative side of his own character,

Trollope was able to maintain his own pride and lift himself higher than otherwise. When he was called upon to write the biography, Trollope was dependent upon the family for information so that he could not make a direct attack, but he does portray Thackeray in such a manner that the book becomes an attack rather than the expected praise of Thackeray. The nature of the biography immediately alienated Thackeray's family from the author and the book was allowed to fall as a failure in relative oblivion. The changes brought in biographical writing by Froude, Strachey and Freud have shown that Trollope's book was written against the prevailing sentiments of its age, but in terms of the modern reader, the book is a revealing account of the relationship between two authors traditionally thought of as "close friends." It is this relationship that we have carefully studied in the hopes that the unscrambling of the data in the little biography will throw new light on the men who helped to make Victorian literature and on the biography itself as a produce of a certain aspect of the culture of the nineteenth century.

Notes

[1]John A. Garraty, The Nature of Biography (New York, 1957), pp. 99-100.

[2]Harold Nicolson, The Development of English Biography (London, 1959), p. 129.

[3]See Adversity, p. 3.

[4]Trollope Letters, p. 472.

[5]Ritchie, "Thackeray and his Biographers," p. 811.

[6]"Recent Discoveries Concerning Thackeray," The Nation, XXXII (January 27, 1881), 56.

[7]Edward T. Mason (ed.), Personal Traits of British Authors (New York, 1891), IV, 262-263.

[8]Thackeray, p. 2.

[9]Nicolson, pp. 65-66.

[10]Ibid., pp. 9-10.

APPENDIX A

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF
THACKERAY AND TROLLOPE
1857-1863

THACKERAY	1857	TROLLOPE
Lectures in London & southern England.	January-February	
Lectures in northern England & Scotland.	February-March	
Defeated for Parliament from city of Oxford.	July 8-21	
	August 18	Finishes The Three Clerks.
In Hamburg.	September	In Florence.
	October 20	Begins Doctor Thorne.
First number of the Virginians.	November	Three Clerks published.
	1858	
	February 11	Leaves London on official postal mission to Egypt.
	early March	Yates leaves for Egypt, writes to Trollope (returns in three weeks).
	March 11	Leaves Alexandria for Palestine.
	April 22-May 10	Travels home via Malta, Gibraltar, and Spain.
	May 11-July	Official visits to Scotland & northern England.

Yates publishes article in Town Talk.	June 12
Yates replies to Thackeray after seeing Dickens.	June 15
Writes to Garrick Club Committee. Doland writes to Yates.	June 19
Yates writes to Committee, after seeing Dickens.	June 23
Committee sides with Thackeray, orders Yates to apologize or retire.	June 26
Yates writes Committee, having see Dickens.	July 1
Dickens writes to Yates telling him not to go to General Meeting.	July 6
Dickens describes affair to Russell.	July 7
Thackeray writes to Committee but does not mail letter, feels punishment greater than offense.	July 9
General Meeting upholds Thackeray.	July 10
Thackeray on continent.	July 13-August 17
Yates expelled from Club.	July 20
Dickens advises Yates to get a lawyer.	July 23
	July (?) In London.
	August-October At home in Ireland.
Returning to London, finds small papers have taken Yates's side.	August 17

In Paris.	September	
	November 16	Leaves London on official postal mission to West Indies.
In Paris	November	
Dickens writes Thackeray concerning Yates, says that Yates came to him for advice.	November 17	
Writes Dickens to say affair no longer in his hands.	November 26	
Writes Committee, telling of Dickens's proposal.	November 28	
Blames Dickens for Yates's letters.	December 2	
Yates publishes "The Histrionic Baronet"	December 4	
Club meets to decide on Yates; Yates brings suit against Doland.	December 5	
Yates publishes another article on Thackeray.	December 11	
	1859	
In Paris.	January	
Agrees to write series for Cornhill.	February 19	
Yates abandons his suit.	March	
	Summer	Returns to London from West Indies.
Accepts editorship of Cornhill.	April 14	
	September	On vacation in Pyrenees.

The Virginians finished.	September 7	
Traveling on continent.	September-October 16	
	October 23	Offers services to *Cornhill*.
	October 26	Smith asks for a novel by December 12.
Explains *Cornhill* to Trollope, offers to publish a story.	October 28	
	November 3-4	Goes to London, meets Smith who suggests *Framley Parsonage*.
	November 4	*Framley Parsonage* begun.
Rejects Yates's poem.	November 17	
First number of *Cornhill* sent to printers.	December 15	
	December	Leaves Ireland; settles at Waltham Cross.
	1860	
	January 1	Resumes work on *Castle Richmond*.
In Paris.	January	
First *Cornhill* Dinner.	January	
Buys 2 Palace Green, Kensington.	March 28	
New York Times publishes Yates's article.	May 26	
Saturday Review reprints *N. Y. Times* article.	June 23	

Sala, who had been Cornhill contributor, accepts editorship of Temple Bar. Yates rumors that Thackeray is jealous. Thackeray on continent.	September	
Dickens writes warm letter of condolence to Yates.	September 23	
Thinks Dickens has abandoned Yates.	September 28	
	October	Goes to Florence.
	November 15	Writes to Thackeray. after the rejection of "Mrs. General Talboys."
First number of Temple Bar.	December	
	1861	
	January 5	Almost loses position on Cornhill.
	Spring	Elected to Garrick Club.
Sees both Trollope and Synge.	May 5	
	August 14	Leaves London for U. S. A.
Yates, traveling in Switzerland with wife and Alfred Austin, has severe attack of gastric fever; Thackeray sympathizes with him.	Autumn	
In Paris.	September	
Death of Major Carmichael-Smyth.	September 9	
	1862	
Resigns editorship of Cornhill.	March 6	

Moves to 2 Palace Green, Kensington.	March 31	
In Paris.	April	Returns from New York.
Loans Synge £1800 with Trollope.	May 11	Loans Synge £1800 with Thackeray.
In Paris.	September	

1863

Invites Trollope to dine.	February 4	
Visits Yorkshire with daughters.	April 6-April 16	
Attack in The Athenaeum on Anne's Story of Elizabeth, which leads to his trouble with the National Shakespeare Committee.	April 25	
Invites Trollope to a dinner.	May 10	
In Belgium and France.	August 17-27	
	October 6	Frances Trollope dies in Florence.
Last Roundabout Paper.	November	
	December 14	Sees Thackeray for last time.
Dies.	December 24	
Burial in Kensal Green Cemetery.	December 29	

APPENDIX B

THE TEXT OF YATES'S TOWN TALK ARTICLE

The full text of Edmund Yates's article, "Literary Talk," in the June 13, 1858, number of Town Talk reads as follows:

> Finding that our pen and ink portrait of Mr. Charles Dickens has been much talked about and extensively quoted, we purpose giving, each week, a sketch of some literary celebrity. This week our subject is
>
> Mr. W. M. THACKERAY.
>
> HIS APPEARANCE.
>
> Mr. Thackeray is forty-six years old, though from the silvery whiteness of his hair, he appears somewhat older. He is very tall, standing upward of six feet two inches, and as he walks erect his height makes him conspicuous in every assembly. His face is bloodless, and not particularly expressive, but remarkable for the fracture of the bridge of the nose, the result of an accident in youth. He wears a small grey whisker, but otherwise is clean shaven. No one meeting him could fail to recognize in him a gentleman; his bearing is cold and uninviting, his style of conversation either openly cynical, or affectedly good natured and benevolent; his bonhomie is forced, his wit biting, his pride easily touched--but his appearance is invariably that of the cool, suave, well-bred gentleman, who, whatever may be rankling within, suffers no surface display of his emotions.
>
> HIS CAREER.
>
> For many years Mr. Thackeray, though a prolific writer, and holding constant literary employment, was unknown by name to the great bulk of the public. To Fraser's Magazine he was a regular contributor, and very shortly after the commencement of Punch, he joined Mr. Mark Lemon's staff. In the Punch pages, appeared many of his wisest, most thoughtful and wittiest essays; "Mr. Brown's Letters to his Nephew" on love, marriage, friendship, choice of a club, &c., contain an amount of worldly wisdom, which, independently of the amusement to be obtained from them, render them really valuable reading to young men beginning life. The Book of Snobs, equally perfect in its way, also originally appeared in Punch. Here, too, were published his buffooneries, his Ballads of Policeman X, his Jeames's Diary, and some other scraps, the mere form of which consisted in outrages on authography, and of which

he is now deservedly ashamed. It was with the publication of the third or fourth number of Vanity Fair, that Mr. Thackeray began to dawn upon the reading public as a great genius. The greatest work, which, with perhaps the exception of The Newcomes, is the most perfect literary dissection of the human heart, done with the cleverest and most unsparing hand, had been offered to and rejected by several of the first publishers in London. But the public saw and recognized its value; the great guns of literature, the Quarterly and the Edinburgh, boomed forth their praises, the light tirailleurs in the monthly and weekly press re-echoed the feux-de-joie, and the novelist's success was made. Pendennis followed, and was equally valued by the literary world, but scarcely so popular with the public. Then came Esmond, which fell almost still-born from the press; and then The Newcomes, perhaps the best of all. The Virginians, now publishing, though admirably written, lacks interest of plot, and is proportionately unsuccessful.

HIS SUCCESS,

commencing with Vanity Fair, culminated with his "Lectures on the English Humorists of the Eighteenth Century," which were attended by all the courts and fashion of London. The prices were extravagant, the Lecturer's adulation of birth and position were extravagant, the success was extravagant. No one succeeds better than Mr. Thackeray in cutting his coat according to his cloth: here he flattered the aristocracy, but when he crossed the Atlantic, George Washington became the idol of his worship; the "Four Georges" the objects of his bitterest attacks. These last-named Lectures have been dead failures in England, though as literary compositions they are most excellent. Our own opinion is, that his success is on the wane; his writings never were understood or appreciated even by the middle class; the aristocracy have been alienated by his American onslaught on their body, and the educated and refined are not sufficiently numerous to constitute an audience; moreover, there is a want of heart in all he writes, which is to be balanced by the most brilliant sarcasm and the most perfect knowledge of the workings of the human heart.*

* Thackeray Letters, IV, facsimile following p. 90.

APPENDIX C

A PARAGRAPH ANALYSIS OF THACKERAY SHOWING
TROLLOPE'S CONTENT AND SOURCES

In the following analysis, each paragraph of the biographical chapter of Thackeray is attributed to its source or sources; where a paragraph has more than one source, the different ones are listed in the order in which they appear in the text. In the case of a questionable attribution, I have enclosed the source in brackets. The parenthesis following Lady Ritchie's name refer to the identity of the source; those following the number of the paragraph refer to the pages covered by the paragraph in the 1879 edition.

1. (pp. 1-2)
   a. Trollope: account of the series and the lack of a biography of Thackeray.
   b. Lady Ritchie (oral): account of Thackeray's disgust with biography.

2. (pp. 2-3)
   Trollope: account of Thackeray's mental operations that led to the forbidding of a life; outline of the first chapter.

3. (p. 3)
   a. Lady Ritchie (2): Thackeray's birth and father.
   b. Trollope: persons known by the writer who might be related.

4. (pp. 3-4)
   a. Lady Ritchie (2): Thackeray's father and mother.
   b. [Lady Ritchie (oral)]: religious differences between Thackeray and his mother.

5. (pp. 4-5)
   George Venables: Thackeray's life at Charterhouse.

6. (pp. 5-6)
   a. Lady Ritchie (3): Thackeray at Cambridge.
   b. [Edward Fitzgerald]: Thackeray and The Snob; his parody of Tennyson's "Timbuctoo."
   c. Thackeray: parody quoted.

7. (p. 6)
   Trollope: no other evidence of literary merit in The Snob.

8. (pp. 6-7)
   a. Trollope: Thackeray's morbid fear of snobbishness.
   b. [Edward Fitzgerald]: The Gownsman.
   c. Trollope: attribution of the dedication of The Gownsman to Thackeray
   d. Thackeray: dedication quoted.

9. (pp. 7-8)
   a. Lady Ritchie (6, 7, 10): Thackeray's life immediately after leaving Cambridge.
   b. Trollope: Thackeray's inability to draw.
   c. Dickens: Thackeray's offer to illustrate The Pickwick Papers.

10. (pp. 8-10)
   a. [Edward Fitzgerald]: Thackeray's inheritance.
   b. Lady Ritchie (5): the loss of the inheritance.
   c. [Edward Fitzgerald]: The National Standard and The Constitutional.
   d. Trollope: the futility of investing money in such projects.
   e. Thackeray: Lovel the Widower quoted.
   [f. footnote: Macready's Diary.]

11-15. (pp. 10-13)
   Trollope: digression on literature as a career.

16. (pp. 13-15)
   a. Trollope: applies digression to Thackeray.
   b. Lady Ritchie (11): Thackeray's contributions to newspapers.
   c. [?]: anecdote of Thackeray's being asked to shorten the Great Hoggarty Diamond.
   d. [?]: Thackeray's invention of pseudonym, Michael Angelo Titmarsh.

17. (pp. 15-16)
   Trollope: Thackeray's idleness.

18. (p. 16)
   a. [Garrick Club Friends]: Thackeray's inferiority complex
   b. Trollope: censure of Thackeray's feelings.

19. (pp. 16-17)
   Trollope: Thackeray's consciousness of his ability but continued uncertainty.

20-24. (pp. 17-20)
Trollope: comparison of Thackeray and Dickens.

25. (pp. 20-21)
a. Lady Ritchie (12, 13): Thackeray's marriage and children.
b. Trollope: the three daughters.
c. Lady Ritchie (oral): Mrs. Thackeray's illness.

26-30. (pp. 21-24)
a. Trollope: Thackeray's connection to Punch.
b. Shirley Brooks: Thackeray on Punch.
c. Thackeray: a poem quoted in a discussion of his inferiority as a poet.

31. (p. 25)
Trollope: The Irish Sketch Book and Thackeray's declaration of his own identity.

32. (pp. 25-26)
Trollope: Vanity Fair; second comparison with Dickens.

33. (pp. 26-29)
a. Trollope: Thackeray's popularity in 1848.
b. Macready: Thackeray's popularity attested in a memoir.
c. Abraham Hayward: article from Edinburgh Review for 1848 extensively quoted.

34. (pp. 30-33)
Trollope: Thackeray's effectiveness prior to Vanity Fair.

35. (pp. 30-33)
a. [Garrick Club Friends]: recollections of Thackeray's impromptu remarks and sketches.
b. Edward Fitzgerald: loan of letters; Flore et Zephyr.
c. Trollope: Thackeray's acquaintances and his poor powers of conversation.
d. [?]: a poem by Thackeray quoted for Trollope after forty years.
e. Trollope: Thackeray's burlesque resulted from melancholy.

36. (p. 33)
a. Lady Ritchie (15): Thackeray's residences in London.
b. [Lady Ritchie (oral)]: anecdote of Thackeray and the Irishman.

37. (pp. 33-34)
[?]: Thackeray's application for a position at the Post Office.

38. (pp. 34-36)
Trollope: Thackeray's inability to be a good civil servant.

39. (p. 36)
Thackeray: letter to Mr. Reed in which he continued to hope for a position in the civil service.

40. (p. 37)
Thackeray: 1850 letter to The Morning Chronicle quoted.

41. (pp. 37-38)
Trollope: disagreement with Thackeray's letter.

42. (pp. 38-39)
a. Trollope: poor procedures in serial writing.
b. Thackeray: letter to Mr. Reed describing sickness that delayed Pendennis.

43. (pp. 39-41)
a. Trollope: reasons Thackeray should have been happy.
b. Thackeray: stanza of White Squall quoted.
c. Lady Ritchie (22): Thackeray's illness.
d. Trollope: reasons Thackeray was melancholy; advice given to himself when young.

44. (p. 41)
Lady Ritchie (14): Thackeray and Amy Crowe.

45. (pp. 41-43)
a. Trollope: The Newcomes.
b. Thackeray: quotations from John Leech's Pictures of Life and Character and references to The Genius of Cruikshank.

46. (pp. 43-45)
a. Trollope: Thackeray's lectures.
b. John Forster: Dickens's thoughts on lectures.
c. Trollope: Thackeray's desire to earn money for his children.
d. Lady Ritchie (19): income of lectures to give inheritance to his children.

47. (pp. 45-46)
a. Lady Ritchie (18, 19): Thackeray's lectures.
b. Trollope: never heard Thackeray's delivery but had to be inferior to Dickens's.

48. (pp. 46-47)
a. Lady Ritchie (15, 16, 19): Thackeray's trips to America, his return, The Newcomes.
b. [Newspaper reviews?]: English reaction to The Four Georges.

49. (pp. 47-48)
    a. [?]: Thackeray defense in 1857 of his lectures.
    b. Trollope: Thackeray's indiscretion in the lectures.

50. (pp. 48-49)
    a. [?] : Thackeray's unsuccessful stand for Oxford suggested by Lady Ritchie (23) .
    b. Trollope: Thackeray's unsuitability for Parliament.

51. (pp. 49-51)
    Trollope: Thackeray and The Cornhill Magazine.

52. (pp. 51-52)
    Trollope: the acceptance of Framley Parsonage.

53. (p. 52)
    Trollope: the reasons for Framley Parsonages's publication.

54. (pp. 52-53)
    Trollope: contributors to the first number of the Cornhill.

55. (pp. 53-54)
    Trollope: contributors to the Cornhill under Thackeray's editorship.

56. (pp. 54-55)
    a. Trollope: Thackeray's inability to be a good editor.
    b. Thackeray: "Thorns in the Cushion" quoted.

57. (pp. 55-56)
    Trollope: the rejected story.

58. (p. 56)
    Trollope: Thackeray's removal to Palace Green.

59. (pp. 56-57)
    Trollope: faulty procedures in serial writing.

60. (p. 57)
    Trollope: Thackeray's lack of method in writing.

61. (pp. 57-58)
    Trollope: Thackeray's death, funeral, and monument in Westminster Abbey.

62. (p. 59)
    Lady Ritchie (21): Thackeray's inheritance for his daughters.

63. (p. 59)
    a. Trollope: Thackeray not a cynic.
    b. Tom Taylor: poem quoted to show Thackeray was not a cynic.

64. (pp. 59-60)
    Trollope: The Synge loan.

65. (pp. 60-61)
    [?] : anecdote from Thackeray's American trip, showing him as a satirist.

66. (p. 61)
    Trollope: conclusion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Annan, Noel Gilroy. Leslie Stephen: His Thought and Character in Relation to his Time. London: MacGibbon and Kee, Ltd., 1951.

Bevington, Merle Mowbray. The Saturday Review, 1855-1868: Representative Educated Opinion in Victorian England. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941.

Booth, Bradford A. Anthony Trollope: Aspects of his Life and Work. London: Edward Hulton and Company, Ltd., 1958.

_____. The Letters of Anthony Trollope. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.

Brookfield, Charles and Frances. Mrs. Brookfield and Her Circle. 2 vols. London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1905.

Brown, John. Letters of Dr. John Brown With Letters from Ruskin, Thackeray, and Others. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1907.

Carr, J. Comyns. Some Eminent Victorians: Personal Recollections in the World of Arts and Letters. London: Duckworth and Company, 1908.

"Club Secrets." The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, and Art, IX (March 24, 1860), 368-369.

The Correspondence of Thomas Carlyle and Ralph Waldo Emerson, 1834-1872. 2 vols. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1883.

"Dickens and His Publishers." Littell's The Living Age, LX (March 5, 1859), 624.

Dickens, Charles. "In Memoriam." The Cornhill Magazine, IX (February, 1864), 129-132.

Downey, Edmund (Editor). Charles Lever: His Life in His Letters. 2 vols. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1906.

The Eclectic Magazine of Foreign Literature, Science, and Art, XLV (November, 1858), 434.

Elwin, Malcolm. Thackeray: A Personality. London: Jonathan Cape, 1932.

Fields, James T. Yesterdays with Authors. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1894.

Forster, John. The Life of Charles Dickens. 2 vols. London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1899.

Friswell, J. Hain. Modern Men of Letters Honestly Criticised. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1870.

Fuller, Hester Thackeray [Ritchie], and Violet Hammersley. Thackeray's Daughter: Some Recollections of Anne Thackeray Ritchie. London: W. J. Pollock and Company, Ltd., 1952.

Garraty, John A. The Nature of Biography. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957.

"Gentlemen Authors." Littell's The Living Age, LVIII (September 4, 1858), 742-744.

Gissing, Algernon and Ellen (Editors). Letters of George Gissing to Members of his Family. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1927.

Haight, Gordon S. (Editor). The George Eliot Letters. 7 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954-1955.

Hodder, George. Memories of My Time Including Personal Reminiscences of Eminent Men. London: Tinsley Brothers, 1870.

Hollingshead, John. My Lifetime. 2 vols. London: Sampson Low, Marston and Company, Limited, 1895.

Hutton, Laurence (Editor). Letters of Charles Dickens to Wilkie Collins, 1851-1870; Selected by Miss Georgina Hogarth. London: J. R. Osgood, McIlvaine and Company, 1892.

[Huxley, Leonard]. The House of Smith, Elder. London: William Clowes and Sons, Limited, 1923.

Irving, Laurence. Henry Irving: The Actor and His World. London: Faber and Faber, 1951.

James, Henry. "Thackerayana." The Nation, XXI (December 9, 1857), 376.

Johnson, Edgar. Charles Dickens: His Tragedy and Triumph. 2 vols. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1952.

[Maine, J. Henry Sumner]. "Mr. Thackeray and the Four Georges." The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, and Art, I (December 8, 1855), 106-107.

Mason, Edward T. (Editor). Personal Traits of British Authors. 4 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891.

McAleer, Edward C. (Editor). Dearest Isa: Robert Browning's Letters to Isabella Blagden. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1951.

Melville, Lewis. William Makepeace Thackeray: A Biography Including Hitherto Uncollected Letters and Speeches and A Bibliography of 1300 Items. 2 vols. London: John Lane, 1910.

Merivale, Herman, and Frank T. Marzials. Life of W. M. Thackeray. London: Walter Scott, 1891.

"Mr. Thackeray at the Surrey Gardens." The Literary Gazette, and Journal of Archaeology, Science, and Art, No. 2090 (February 7, 1857), 136-138.

"Mr. Thackeray in Edinburgh." The Literary Gazette, and Journal of Archaeology, Science, and Art, No. 2099 (April 11, 1857), 351-352.

Morley, John. Recollections. 2 vols. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917.

Mudge, Isadore Gilbert, and M. Earl Sears. A Thackeray Dictionary: The Characters and Scenes of the Novels and Short Stories Alphabetically Arranged. London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1910.

"Newspaper Gossip." The Saturday Review of Politics, Science, and Art, IX (June 23, 1860), 799-800.

Nicolson, Harold. The Development of English Biography. London: The Hogarth Press, 1959.

Partington, Wilfred. "The Indiscretion of Anthony Trollope." Bookman, LXXIV (February, 1933), 207.

Pym, Horace N. (Editor). Memoirs of Old Friends, Being Extracts from the Journals and Letters of Caroline Fox of Penjerrick, Cornwall, from 1835 to 1871. London: Smith, Elder, and Company, 1882.

Ray, Gordon N. (Editor). The Letters and Private Papers of William Makepeace Thackeray: Collected and Edited by Gordon N. Ray. 4 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945-1946.

_____. Thackeray: The Age of Wisdom, 1847-1863. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1958.

_____. Thackeray: The Uses of Adversity, 1811-1846. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1955.

_____ (Editor). William Makepeace Thackeray: Contributions to the Morning Chronicle. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1955.

"Recent Discoveries Concerning Thackeray." The Nation, XXXII (January 27, 1881), 56-57.

Ritchie, Anne Thackeray. "Biographical Introductions." The Biographical Edition of the Works of William Makepeace Thackeray. 13 vols. London: Smith, Elder, and Company, 1898-1899.

_____. "Note to Sir Leslie Stephen's 'Life of W. M. Thackeray.'" The Biographical Edition of the Works of William Makepeace Thackeray (London: Smith, Elder, and Company, 1898-1899), XIII, 688.

_____. "The First Editor: And the Founder." The Cornhill Magazine, n.s. XXVIII (January, 1910), 1-5.

_____. "The First Number of 'The Cornhill.'" The Cornhill Magazine, n.s. I (July, 1896), 1-16.

_____. "Thackeray and his Biographers." Illustrated London News, XCVIII (June 20, 1891), 811.

Ritchie, Hester Thackeray (Editor). Thackeray and His Daughter, The Letters and Journals of Anne Thackeray Ritchie, With Many Letters of William Makepeace Thackeray, Selected and Edited by Hester Thackeray Ritchie. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1924.

Robertson Scott, J. W. The Story of the Pall Mall Gazette, of its First Editor, Frederick Greenwood, and of its Founder, George Murray Smith. London: Oxford University Press, 1950.

Robinson, Howard. Britain's Post Office: A History of Development from the Beginnings to the Present Day. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

_____. The British Post Office, A History. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948.

Sadleir, Michael. Trollope, A Commentary. Revised Edition. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Company, 1947.

Sala, George Augustus. The Life and Adventures of George Augustus Sala, Written by Himself. London: Cassell and Company, Limited, 1896.

_____. Things I Have Seen and People I Have Known. 2 vols. London: Cassell and Company, Limited, 1894.

Smith, Peter. "The Cornhill Magazine--Number 1." A Review of English Literature, IV (April, 1963), 23-24.

Spark, Muriel (Editor). The Brontë Letters. London: Peter Nevill, Ltd., 1954.

Spielmann, M. H. The History of "Punch." New York: The Cassell Publishing Company, 1895.

Stebbins, Lucy and Richard Poate. The Trollopes: The Chronicles of a Writing Family. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.

Stephen, Leslie. "Life of W. M. Thackeray." The Biographical Edition of the Works of William Makepeace Thackeray (London: Smith, Elder, and Company, 1898-1899), XIII, 689-717.

_____. Studies of a Biographer. 4 vols. London: Duckworth and Company, 1902.

"Thackeray." The New York Daily Times, V (October 29, 1855), 2.

Thackeray, William Makepeace. The Biographical Edition of the Works of William Makepeace Thackeray. 13 vols. London: Smith, Elder, and Company, 1898-1899.
"De Juventute," XII, 229-241.
"Nil Nisi Bonum," XII, 173-179.
"On Screens in Dining-Rooms," XII, 217-222.
"Small Beer Chronicle," XII, 302-308.
"Thorns in the Cushion," XII, 209-216.

_____. Thackeray's Letters to an American Family With An Introduction by Lucy W. Baxter and Original Drawings by Thackeray. New York: The Century Company, 1904.

Trollope, Anthony. An Autobiography. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., n.d.

_____. Thackeray. "English Men of Letters." London: Macmillan and Company, 1879.

_____. "W. M. Thackeray." The Cornhill Magazine, IX (February, 1864), 134-137.

"The Virginians." The Literary Gazette, and Journal of Belles Lettres, Science, and Art, No. 2129 (November 7, 1857), 1065-1066.

"The Virginians." The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, and Art, VIII (November 19, 1859), 610-612.

Walpole, Hugh. Anthony Trollope. "The English Men of Letters." New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928.

Wright, William Aldis (Editor). More Letters of Edward Fitzgerald. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1901.

[Yates, Edmund]. "Echoes from the London Clubs." The New York Times, IX (May 26, 1860), 2.

_____. Edmund Yates: His Recollections and Experiences. 2 vols. London: Richard Bentley and Son, 1884.

Unpublished Sources

Trollope's Diary for the Composition of Thackeray. Bodleian Library. Trollope Papers II. MS. Don. C. 9, 10, 10*.

Trollope's Questions and Lady Ritchie's Answers. Bodleian Library. Trollope Papers II. MS. Don. C. 10. f. 72, 73.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Mark Douglas Hawthorne was born December 9, 1938, in Berea, Ohio. He was graduated from New Hanover High School in Wilmington, North Carolina, and from Wake Forest College in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, with the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1960. From September, 1960, until February, 1962, he studied at the University of Florida and worked as a graduate assistant in the Department of English until he received the degree of Master of Arts. From February, 1962, until the present time he has pursued his work toward the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Mark Douglas Hawthorne is married to the former Mary Lydia Seaber and is the father of one child. He is a member of Eta Sigma Phi, Phi Beta Kappa, the Modern Language Association, and the South Atlantic Modern Language Association.

This dissertation was prepared under the direction of the chairman of the candidate's supervisory committee and has been approved by all members of that committee. It was submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and to the Graduate Council, and was approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

August 8, 1964

E. Ruffin Jones
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Dean, Graduate School

Supervisory Committee:

William Ruff
Chairman

Alton C. Morris

August H. Stark